7433

Religions of India

by

Karmarkar

THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA

VOLUME I

THE VRĀTYA OR DRAVIDIAN SYSTEMS

(Comprising Śaivism, Śāktism, Zoolatry, Dendrolatry and other Minor Systems)

BY

A. P. KARMARKAR,
M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

Professor of Indology, G. S. College of Yoga, Lonavla.
Formerly Post-Graduate Teacher, University of Bombay.

WITH A FOREWORD

By

The Hon'ble Shri. R. R. DIWAKAR,
M.A., LL.B.

Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

MIRA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
LONAVLA (INDIA)

First Published, 1950.

Rupees Sixteen only.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

(1) *Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka*
Government of Bombay Kannaḍa Research Grant Publication. Dharwar, 1939. ... ... Rs. 2/-

(2) *Kannaḍa Saṁskṛti* (In Kannada)
Dharwar, 1943. (Out of print) ... ... „ 1/12/-

(3) *Cultural History of Karnāṭaka.* Dharwar, 1947. „ 5/-

(4) *Purāṇic Words of Wisdom*
(अष्टादशपुराणांतर्गत-नीतिसार-सुभाषितसंग्रहः)
Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. Bombay, 1947. ... „ 2/-

(5) *The Evolution of Indian Constitution*
Bombay, 1948 ... ... „ 3/-

(6) *Cultural Index of the Purāṇas*
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Silver Jubilee Fellowship Volume (In Preparation).

(7) *Critical Edition of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa*
(In Preparation).

Printed by R. R. Bakhale, at the Bombay Vaibhav Press, Servants of India Society's Home, Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay, and Published by Dr. A. P. Karmarkar, M.A., LL.B., Ph. D., Alandi Devachi, District Poona.

AT THE FEET OF

SAU. JĀNAKĪBĀĪ

THE MOTHER DIVINE

ERRATA

Page	*Line*	*Instead of*	*Read*
14	38	Vaṇic	Vaṇik
42	5th para	Ammān	Amān
73	16	,,	,,
45	14	Khafage	Khafaje
57	8	S'ava	S'arva
112	Fn. 4	Monir	Monier
157	9	Berossus	Berosus
285	8, Fn.	Arokiasamy	Arokiaswamy
In the text		Bhattacarya	Bhattacharya
,, ,,		Jnana Prakasar	Gnana Prakasar
9	35	Andhas	Andhras
30	17	,,	,,
24	13, Fn. 2	Kauśitaki	Kauṣītaki
83	13	Mahābhārata	Mahāvrata
86	28	Āyāpaṭṭas	Āyāgapaṭṭas
,,	Fn. 2	p. 138	p. 187
,,	Fn. 5	p. 138	p. 187 f.
93	11	Basrah	Basarh
95	34	ex-veto	ex-voto
126	19	(1627–1658)	(1556–1573)
207	5	Slaves	Slavs

FOREWORD

There is no doubt that a number of Orientalists have shed light on Vedic religion and culture. But it must be said that not enough has yet been written about pre-Vedic and non-Vedic religions and cultures, traces of which are evident here and there in India. It is true that by an inherent genius for synthesis the Aryans in India evolved a system of culture and religion after absorbing and assimilating a baffling variety of beliefs, cults, and ritualistic forms. But the constituent elements of this synthesised culture await research. It is only after a vast amount of research along these lines that we shall be able to assess the contribution of the different schools of thought, religion, and culture to the present multi-coloured culture of India.

I look upon the work of Shri. A. P. Karmarkar as one in that direction. He brings to the task a very sympathetic outlook, deep scholarship, and assiduous industry. As it happens in all such attempts, some of his theories and inferences may not be acceptable to all scholars; but I am sure they will immensely provoke thought and thus make way for discovery of truth which is the ultimate object of all inquiry.

R. R. DIWAKAR,
Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

PREFACE

If we leave aside the Islamic religion, we find that all the Asiatic religions have one common origin, which can be traced on the soil of India. Almost since the beginnings of history Indians have proved themselves intuitionally religious and naturally scholarly. When all the other peoples of the world were struggling in the dim darkness of Saṁsāra, the *pre-Vedic* and the *Ṛgvedic* bards were busy in singing psalms of devotion from the lofty heights of the Himālayas, and in explaining the inter-relation of God, World and the Souls. Since then the religious link stands unbroken on the Indian soil, and we find the emergence of various schools of religious thought and philosophy. Our ancestors have left a rich heritage behind them, and eventually, Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism, Jainism, Buddhism, Theosophy, Gandhism and others have proved to be their wonderful off-shoots during these thousands of years. Religion is still a living force in the country.

The 'Aryan' and the 'Dravidian'– or more properly 'Vrātya', as applied to Indian Religion and Philosophy have become rather indistinguishable factors today. The subject of the Religions of India has been pursued either in its entirety or piecemeal by various scholars like Barth, Hopkins, Wilson, Monier Williams, Slater (who has mainly attempted the problem of the Dravidian culture in general), Glasenapp, R. G. Bhandarkar, Farquhar and others. But none of them has laid down any clear-cut and broad outline, so that one could distinguish exactly between the Aryan and the Dravidian–or more properly Vrātya, phases in Indian religious thought. We feel courageous to say this, mainly because, the various data that have become available to us during the last five and twenty years in the field of Epigraphy, Numismatics, Archæology, and other allied sciences, have changed the outlook of scholarship, and have proved beyond doubt the possibility of the existence of a marvellous civilization of the Vrātyas in pre-Aryan India. Especially, the wonderful discoveries made at Mohenjo Daro, Harappa and other proto-Indian sites are of an absorbing interest.

It was in this light that I took a detailed survey of the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and other finds, the originals of twenty-four Purāṇas and Upa-Purāṇas, and the Vedic, Brāhmaṇic, Upanisadic, Epic, Tāntric and other allied literature. I have made full use of all the Epigraphic, Numismatic and the other available materials. I found in the Purāṇas a very valuable material indeed! It is my firm opinion that they contain the history of man from the early beginnings of history down to about the fourteenth century A. D.

By making the Indus Valley discoveries as the basis of my study, I could find out a clue in regard to the origin of the various problems of the Vrātya religion and thought. In fact the early beginnings of Monotheism, the doctrines of Karma and Rebirth, Yoga and Bhakti, and Asceticism and Ritual can now be traced to this ancient lore of the Vrātyas. The Ṛgvedic bards have described the ritual of the Vrātyas as *anya-vrata*. The notion of Trimūrti has a place by

itself in the early notions of the Proto-Indian Vrātyas. The Indus Valley finds throw light on Dendrolatry and Zoolatry also. It is just possible that totemism came into vogue in a period prior to that of the Indus Valley civilization.

I have tried to prove in the first Part that the earliest pre-Vedic inhabitants of India were designated by the Vedic Aryans as Vrātyas, that the expression 'Draviḍa' is evidently of a later date, and that it was originally equivalent to the expression *Tāmiḷ*. It was only the Greeks and other Westerners, and as an imitation the Indian writers of the early centuries of the Christian era, that have used expressions like Druid, Dramiḷa, etc. As everything went to them through the country of the Pāṇḍyas and others, they wrongly identified the culture of India with the little country of the Tāmiḷians with whom they had directly come into contact.

It is our hypothesis that the Early Man, who is designated as Dravidian later on, must have originated in the Deccan plateau, which consists of the most ancient rock-system capable of originating human beings. The recent discoveries made at Langhnaj on the banks of the Sābarmatī river almost prove the early existence of the Dolicho-cephalic race in Southern India. This Early Man need not have come from abroad as some scholars postulate it.

The Aryans, on the other hand, were already on the borderland of India since a very early time. And the Indus Valley finds and the *Ṛgveda* only prove that both these cultures must have thrived side by side for a very long time in the early period of Indian history. It is also an interesting factor that the Aryan compositions mostly belong to this part of the country alone. And the Aryans seem to have spread themselves from the borderland of India up to Babylon. The unique circumstance in the history of the Aryans is that the Vedic Ārya or the Avestic 'Airya' are not to be found in any other literature of the world. If this be so, then India seems to have been the cradle of both the Aryan and the Vrātya cultures. In the light of this statement the problem of the 'Indo-European' or 'Indo-Germanic' seems *prima facie* rather fallacious.

If we can draw a keen line of distinction between the *Theistic* and the *Pantheistic* aspects in early Indian religious thought, then we may definitely assert that all the *Theistic* belonged to the Vrātyas, and all the *Pantheistic* to the Aryans. The Vrātya Pantheon consisted of the Divine Triad of Śiva, Ammā and Kārttikeya or Mūrugaṉ, the later Gaṇapati, Liṅga (which seems to be of a foreign origin), Sun, Nāga, Fish, Tree, etc. We have dealt with all these in detail, with the exception of the Sun, which topic more fittingly comes under Vaiṣṇavism. The Aryans gradually assimilated all these gods into their own pantheon. Along with the development of the gods and goddesses, there came into being the various religious sects and philosophical systems of the Vrātyas. The Yatis, the Arhats, the Gārāgirs and the Pāśupatas came into vogue almost since the Proto-Indian times. In matters of religion and philosophy monotheism came into being since the Indus Valley period.

We have tried to prove in the first Part, that the Indus Valley civilization was a *running civilization* in so far as it is inclusive of both the pre-Vedic and post-Ṛgvedic periods. It extended itself up to the end of the period of the *Atharvaveda i.e.* till the date of the Flood. The legend of Manu and the Flood has a historical back-ground, and it has thrown a wonderful light on one of the missing links in early Indian history. The consequences of the Indus Valley civilization were of a far-reaching nature indeed! As Berosus and the Genesis point out, people half-men and half-fishes migrated to Sumer and introduced the art of writing and building. A tradition is current that these half-men and half-fishes had been also to the border-land of Mexico. Look at the mighty strides taken by the Mīnas or Matsyas of Proto-India into the different parts of the world! To one who is *Aryan-minded* this may look all topsy-turvy. But history is helpless in this matter. It has also been my contention that the Aryans of reformist tendencies like the Bhṛgus must have played a prominent rôle in the Indus Valley period, and that they were possibly responsible for the picto-phonographic inscriptions in Vedic Sanskrit.

I have dealt in this volume with the main off-shoots of the Vrātya religion and philosophy as propounded in the Indus Valley period, having reserved the second Volume for all the remaining religions which were reared on the soil of India.

The present work is mainly the outcome of the Thesis submitted by me for the Ph. D. Degree, which was awarded to me in the year 1943. I worked under the guidance of the Rev. H. Heras, S. J., Director, Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay, and during his absence from India, under Prof. G. M. Moraes, M.A. I have later on effected some important changes in the original work. The second Volume is under preparation, and shall soon see the light of the day.

I must express my deep indebtedness to the Hon'ble Shri. R. R. Diwakar, M.A., LL.B., Minister of State for Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, for so kindly giving a Foreword for this Volume. He is an eminent Savant of Karnāṭaka, which is the Province of my birth.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my *Guru* the Rev. H. Heras, S. J., and Prof. G. M. Moraes, M.A., for the help and guidance they have rendered to me during the period of my study. I am extremely grateful to Dr. G. S. Ghurye, M.A., Ph.D., Head of the Department of Sociology, University of Bombay, for making very valuable suggestions in connection with the subject-matter of the work; to my Respected Father-in-law G. M. Phatak, Esq., M.A., LL.B., Retired First Class Sub-Judge, who was responsible for initiating me in the Ph. D. course, but who is unfortunately now no more to see his object realized: and to B. R. Patwardhan, Esq., M.A., LL.B., Retired Sir Nyāyādhish, Jamkhandi (State), R. S. Vaze, Esq., B.A., LL.B., District and Sessions Judge, Ahmednagar, and R. G. Deshpande, Esq., M.A., Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Belgaum, for rendering timely help to me in furtherance of my Ph.D. studies. My heartfelt thanks are due to B. Anderson, Esq., M.A., Assistant Librarian, University of Bombay, S. V. Shitut, Esq., B.A. (Hons), Bombay Corporation,

N. G. Ghaisas, Esq., W. T. Instructor, Bombay, Principal N.G. Tavkar, B.A. (Hons), R. A. Karnik, Esq., B.A. (Hons), D. V. Rangnekar, Esq., B.A. (Hons), Secretariat Bombay, H. M. Priyolkar, Esq., G. D. A., and J. D'Souza, Esq., M.A., Librarian, I. H. R. Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay, for rendering valuable assistance to me during the course of my study and the publication of the work.

I must express my deep indebtedness to Prof. P. K. Gode, M. A., Curator, Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Poona, and to Dr. A. D. Pusalker, M. A., LL.B., Ph. D., Assistant Director, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, for their constant help and brilliant suggestions made to me during the period of writing and publication of this Volume. The University of Bombay has laid me under its deepest obligations by awarding the Research Studentship to me for a period of two years and a half for carrying on the work, and by further sanctioning a substantial grant towards the publication of the Volume. Best of all, I owe a great deal to Mrs. Sushilabai Karmarkar, who kept at my disposal all the gold and will she possessed in furtherance of my studies; and to Master Jagadīśa and Miss Mīrā for helping me in arranging the Index-cards.

I feel extremely grateful to Shri. R. R. Bakhale, Senior Member of the Servants of India Society, Bombay, for the decency in printing and excellent get up of this Volume.

Nizam's Guest House,
Bhandarkar O. R. Institute,
POONA 4.
Akṣayya-tṛtīyā,
May 1st, 1949.

A. P. KARMARKAR.

CONTENTS

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I General Literature.

Aiyangar, M. Srinivasa, Tamil Studies. Madras, 1914.

Altekar, A. S., The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times. Poona, 1934.

Aravamuthan, T. G., Some Survivals of the Harappa Culture. Bombay, 1942.

Arbmann, E., Rudra. Uppasala, 1922.

Arokiaswamy, A. P., The Doctrine of Grace in the Śaiva Siddhānta. Trichinopoly, 1935.

Ayyar, C. V. Narayana, Origin and early History of Śaivism in South India. Madras, 1936.

Banerjea, Jitendra Nath, The Development of Hindu Iconography. Calcutta, 1941.

Banerji, R. D., Pre-historic, Ancient and Hindu India. London, 1934.

Banerji Sastri, Anantprasad, Asura India. Patna, 1926.

Barth, A., The Religions of India (Trans. by Rev. J. Wood). London, 1914.

Belvalkar, S. K., and Ranade, R. D., History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. II, Creative Period. Poona, 1927.

Bhandarkar, D. R., Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture. Madras, 1940.

Bhandarkar, R. G., Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and other Minor Religious Systems. Grundriss, 1913 (also Collected Works of R. G. B. Vol. IV, Poona).

Bhattacharya, J. N., Hindu Castes and Sects. Calcutta, 1896.

Briggs, George W., Gorakhnath and the Kānphaṭas. Oxford University Press, 1938.

Caldwell, Right Rev. Robert, A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages, 3rd. Ed. Revised by Wyatt and Pillai. London, 1913.

Carlton Patrick, Buried Empires. London, 1939.

Chanda, Ramaprasad, (1) The Indus Valley in the Vedic period. Calcutta, 1926.

(2) Civilization of the Indus Valley: Memoirs of the Arch. Sur. of India. Calcutta, 1929.

Chatterji, J. C., Kashmir Shaivism, Srinagar, 1914.

Childe, V. Gordon, (1) The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origin. London, 1926.

(2) New Light on the Most Ancient East. London, 1934.

Coomaraswamy, Anand K., (1) History of Indian and Indonesian Art. London, 1927.

(2) Mythology of the Aryan Nations, Vols. I and II. London, 1870 (with Sister Nivedita).

Crooke, William, The Popular Religion and Folklore in Northern India, Vols. I–II. Constable, 1896.

Das, A.C., Rigvedic India, Vol. I. Calcutta, 1925.

Das, S. K., Śakti or the Divine Power. Calcutta, 1934.

Dasgupta, S., History of Indian Philosophy, Vols. I–III. Cambridge University Press.

Dikshitar, V. R. R., (1) Studies in Tamil Literature. Madras, 1942.

(2) The Lalitā Cult. Madras, 1942.

Dowson, John, A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology and Religion, Geography and Literature. London, 1903.

Diwakar, R. R., Vacanaśāstra-rahasya. Dharwar, 1935.

Dutt, R. C., The Civilization of India. London, 1902.

Elliot, Charles, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vols. I-III. London, 1921.

Elmore, Wilber T., Dravidian Gods in Modern Hinduism. Madras, 1925.

Farquhar, J. N., An Outline of the Religious Literature of India. Oxford Un. Press, 1920. (*O. R. L. I.*).

Fausboll, Indian Mythology according to the Mahābhārata in outline.

Fergusson, James, Tree and Serpent Worship. London, 1910.

Garbe, R., Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Grundriss, 1896.

Getty, Alice, (1) Gaṇeśa, Monograph on the Elephant-faced God. Oxford, 1936.
(2) Gods of Northern Buddhism. Oxford, 1914.

Glasenapp, Helmuth, Der Hindusmus, Munchen Kurt Wolff. Verlag, 1922.

Gopinatha Rao, T., Elements of Hindu Iconography, Vols. I-II. Madras, 1914, 1916.

Gnana Prakasar, S., Philosophical Śaivism or Śaiva Siddhānta. Ceylon.

Griswold, H. D., The Religion of the Rigveda. Oxford Uni. Press, 1923.

Hachin, J., Asiatic Mythology. London, 1932.

Hall, H. R., Ancient History of the Near East. London, 1933.

Havell, E. B., Ideals of Indian Art. Murray, 1920.

Hazra, R. C., Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs. Dacca University Bulletin 22. Calcutta, 1940.

Heras, Rev. H., La Religion de los Proto-Indios y su Evolucion en las Nacione Mediterraneas (*MS.*).

Herzfeld, Ernest, Kushano—Sasanian Coins. Memoirs of the Arch. Sur. of India, No. 38.

Hewitt, J. F., The Ruling Races of Pre-historic Times in India, South-Western Asia and Southern Europe. Westminister.

Hillebrandt, A., (1) Ritual—Litteraturi, Vedische Opper und Zauber. Strassburg, 1897. (2) Vedische Mythologie. Breslou, 1927/1929.

Hopkins, E. W., The Religions of India. Bosten, 1908.

Hull, E. R., Hinduism. Trichinopoly, 1919.

Hunter, G. R., The Script of Harappa and Mohenjo Daro, and its connection with other scripts. London, 1934.

Iyengar, Masti Venkatesa, Popular Culture in Karnataka. Bangalore, 1937.

Iyengar, P. T. Srinivasa, History of the Tamils. Madras, 1929.

Iyengar, P. T. S., Outlines of Indian Philosophy. Benares, 1909.

Iyengar, T. R. Sesha, Dravidian India, Vol. I. Madras, 1925 and 1933 (two Ed.).

Jouveau Dubreuil, G., Dravidian Architecture. Madras, 1917.

Kanakasabhai, V., The Tamils 1800 Years Ago. Madras, 1904.

Karmarkar, A. P., (1) Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka. Dharwar, 1939. (*With Kalamdani, N. B.*).
(2) Cultural History of Karnāṭaka. Dharwar, 1947.

Keith, A. B., (1) Religion and Philosophy of the Veda, Vols. 31, 32 (Harvard Oriental Series). Cambridge 1925. (2) Sāṅkhya System. Calcutta, 1918.

Kendrick, T. D., The Druids. London, 1927.

Kennedy, J., Hindu Mythology. London, 1831.

Khare, G. H., Mūrti-Vijñāna (Marāṭhī). Poona, 1939.

Krishna Sastri, H., South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses. Madras, 1916.

Levi, S., J. Przyluski, and J. Bloch, Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India (Translated from the French by P. C. Bagchi. Calcutta, 1929).

Macdonell, A. A., (1) Lectures on Comparative Religion. Calcutta, 1925.
(2) History of Sanskrit Literature. London, 1900.
(3) Vedic Mythology. Strassburg, 1897.

Macdonell, A. A., and Keith A. B., Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, Vols. I–II. London, 1912.

Macfie, J. M., Myths and Legends of India. Edinburgh, 1924.

Mackay, E. J. H., (1) Further Excavations at Mohenjo Daro, Vols. I–II. Delhi, 1938. (2) The Indus Civilization. London, 1935.

Mackenzie, Donald A., Indian Myth and Legend. London.

Macnicol, Nichol, Indian Theism. Oxford Uni. Press, 1915.

Marshall, John, Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization, Vols. I–III. London, 1931.

Martin, A. C., Iconography of Southern India (Trans. of J. Dubreuil's work).

Martin, Rev. E. Osborn, The Gods of India. London, 1914.

M'Crindle, J. M., Ancient India as described in Classical Literature. Constable and Co., Westminister, 1901.

Mehta, Ratilal N., Pre-Buddhist India. Bombay, 1939.

Menon, T. K. Krishna, The Dravidian Culture and its Diffusion. Ernakulam, 1937.

Minakshi, C., Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas. Madras, 1938.

Mookerji, R. K., Hindu Civilization (from the earliest times up to the establishment of the Maurya Empire). London, 1936.

Moor, T., The Hindu Pantheon. Madras, 1864.

Müir, J., Original Sanskrit Texts, Vols. I–V. London, 1872–1884.

Murdoch, John, The Religious History of India. Madras, 1900.

Nandimath, S. C., A Handbook of Vīraśaivism. Dharwar.

Nivedita Sister, and Coomaraswamy, A., Myths of the Hindus and the Buddhists. New York.

Oldenberg, H., (1) Die lehre der Upanishaden und de Anfange des Buddhismus. Göttingen, 1915.
(2) Die Religion des Veda. Berlin, 1894.
(3) Indian Und Die Religion-swissenschaft. Berlin, 1906.

Oldham, C. F., The Sun and the Serpent. London, 1905.

Oppert, Gustav, The Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarsha or India. Westminister, 1893.

Pai, D. A., Monograph of the Religious Sects in India among the Hindus. Bombay, 1928.

Pargiter, F. E., Ancient Indian Historical Tradition. London, 1922.

Pillai, N. S. Purnalingam, Tamil India. Munnirpallam, 1927.

Pillai, Nallasvami, Studies in Śaiva Siddhānta. Madras, 1911.

Pillai, S. K., The Ancient Tamils as depicted in the Tolkappiyam, Posuladibaram, Pt. I. Madras, 1934.

Pischel, R., and K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. Stuttgart, 1889–1897.

Radhakrishnan, S., Indian Philosophy, Vols. I–II. London, 1927.

Ramakrishna (Śrī), Centenary Committee, The Cultural Heritage of India, Vols. I–III. Calcutta.

Ranade, R. D., A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy. Poona, 1926.

Rapson, E. J. (Edited by), The Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Ancient India. Cambridge Uni. Press, 1922.

Rice, E. P., Kanarese Literature. Calcutta, 1918.

Sastri, K. A. Nilakanta, The Colas, Vols. I–II. Madras, 1935–1937.

Schomerus, Der Śaiva Siddhānta. Leipzig.

Scott, George, R., Phallic Worship. London, 1941.

Sen, D. C., History of Bengali Language and Literature. Calcutta, 1911. (*H.B.L.L.*).

Sergi, G., The Mediterranean Race. London, 1901.

Slater, Gilbert, The Dravidian Element in Indian Culture. London, 1934.

Stein, O., Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī. Bombay.

Subramanian, K. V., The Origin of Śaivism and its history in the Tamil Land. Madras, 1929.

Thomas, P., Epics, Myths and Legends of India. Bombay.

Tilak, B. G., The Arctic Home in the Vedas. Poona, 1925.

Venkataramanayya, N., Rudra–Śiva. Madras, 1941.

Vogel, J. Ph., Indian Serpent-Lore. London, 1926.

Waddell, L. A., (1) The Aryan Origin of the Alphabet—Disclosing the Sumero-Phœnician Parentage of our Letters Ancient and Modern. London, 1927.
(2) The Makers of Civilization in Race and History. London, 1929.
(3) The Indo-Sumerian Seals Deciphered. London, 1925.

Ward, Rev. W., A view of the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindus including a minute description of their manners and customs-translation from their principal works, Vols. I–II. Birmingham, 1817.

Weber, A., History of Indian Literature. London, 1892.

Westropp, Hodder M., and C. Staniland Wake, Ancient Symbol Worship (2nd Ed.). New York, 1875.

Whitehead, Rev. H., The Village Gods of South India. London, 1921.

Wilkins, W. J., Hindu Mythology. Calcutta, 1913.

Williams, M. Monier, Brahmanism and Hinduism. London, 1891.

Wilson, John, (1) Essays and Lectures chiefly on the Religion of the Hindus, Vols. I-II. London, 1862.
(2) Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus. London, 1861.

Winternitz, M., History of Indian Literature (Trans.), Vols. I–II. Calcutta.

Woodroffe, John, Shakti and Shakta. Madras, 1929.

Wood, J., The Religions of India. London, 1913.

Zimmer, H., Altindisches Leben Die Cultur Der Vedischen Arier. Berlin, 1879.

II Original Texts and Translations.

Mahābhārata—The Ādi, Āraṇyaka, Udyoga and Virāṭa Parvans. Edited by the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Poona. The remaining *Parvans* of the Kumbhakoṇam Edition. *Harivaṁśa*, Bombay Ed. (*Mbh.*).

Purāṇas: *Agni*, Ānandāśrama Series. *Bhāgavata*, Bombay Ed. *Brahmāṇḍa*, Bombay Ed. *Brahmavaivarta*, Bombay Ed. *Bhaviṣya*, Bombay Ed. *Bṛhaddharma*, Bibliothica Indica, Calcutta, 1889. *Devī-Bhāgavata*, Bombay Ed. *Garuḍa*, Bombay Ed. *Kālikā*, Bombay Ed. *Kūrma*, Bombay Ed. (also Calcutta Ed.). *Liṅga*, Bombay Ed. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, Bombay Ed. *Matsya*, Ānandāśrama Series, Poona; also Bombay Ed. *Nāradīya*, Bombay Ed. *Padma*, Ānandāśrama Series, Poona. *Saura*, Bombay Ed. *Śiva*, Bombay Ed. *Skānda*, Bombay Ed. *Vāmana*, Bombay Ed *Varāha*, Bibliothica Indica, Calcutta. *Viṣṇu*, Bombay Ed *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Bombay Ed. *Vāyu*, Bombay Ed.

Kirfel, W., Purāṇa-Pañcalakṣaṇa. Verlag, Bonn, 1927.

Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Ed. by A. B. Keith. Oxford, 1909.

Aitareya Brāhmana (Vols. I-II), Ed. and Trans. by Martin Haug. Bombay, 1863.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, Ed. by Shama Sastri. Mysore, 1919. Trans. by same. Mysore, 1923.

Atharvaveda-Saṁhitā., Vols. I-II, Trans. by William D. Whitney. Harvard Or. Series. Cambridge. (*AV.*).

The Veda of the Black Yajus School (Parts I-II), Ibid., 1914.

Bṛhad-Devatā attributed to Śaunaka, Ed. by A. A. Macdonell, Parts I-II. Cambridge, 1904.

Bṛhat-Saṁhitā of Varāhamihira (Marāṭhī), Ed. by J. H. Athalye. Ratnagiri, 1874.

Gṛhyasūtras (Parts I-II), Trans. by H. Oldenberg. Oxford, 1886. (*G.S.*).

Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva-Bhaṭṭa, Ed. by Durga Prasad, and K. P. Parab. Bombay, 1915.

Mahānirvāṇa T. (T. of Great Liberation), Trans. by Avalon A. London, 1913.

Mālatī-Mādhava of Bhavabhūti, Ed. by M. R. Telang. Bombay, 1892.

Rāmāyaṇa, Ed. by Pansikar. Bombay, 1909.

Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (Vols. I-IV), Ed. by F. Max Müller. London, 1877. (*RV.*).

Do. Trans. Vols. I-II. by Griffith, T. A. Benares, 1891-97.

Sacred Books of the East Series, Vols. II, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XX, XXIX, XXX, XLI, XLIII, and XLIV.

Upaniṣads-The Thirteen, Trans. by Hume, R. E. Oxford, 1921.

III Journals, &c.

We have adopted the following abbreviations :—

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (*A. B. O. R. I.*), Archæological Survey of India. Annual Reports (*A. S. I.*), Epigraphia Carnatica (*E. C.*), Epigraphia Indica (*E. I.*), Indian Antiquary (*I. A.*), Indian Culture (*I. C.*), Indian Historical Quarterly (*I. H. Q.*), Journal of the American Oriental Society (*J. A. O. S.*), Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (*J. R. A. S.*), Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society (*J. B. B. R. A. S.*), Journal of the University of Bombay (*J. U. B.*), and Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics (*E. R. E.*).

PART I

THE VRATYAS AND THE ARYANS

CHAPTER I

EARLY INDIA

Introductory—Prehistoric Periods—Peoples and Languages.

Introductory

The history of man and its working in the field of religion can be much better traced on the soil of India than in any other part of the world. Almost since the early beginnings of history India has been a resort of various races, and we find here, for the first time, a commingling of cultures on a large scale. Nature, again, has endowed the Indian with very rare gifts in the field of mysticism. The diversities of climate have allowed him to think in different ways in regard to the mutual relationship between the three primary entities *i.e.* God, World, and the Soul. Both the factors of race and nature have so much contributed to the development of the different phases of religion that, in no other country have come into being ideas regarding the vast multitude of gods and goddesses along with their retinue of Apsaras and others, and the spirits and goblins, to the same extent as it has happened in India.

India has its own history and culture. Our ancestors have written it either in blood or in writing. Even the names of Gandhāra, Sāñcī, Kārle, Ellora, Hampe, Paṭṭadkal, Belūr, Mahābalipuram, Puri and others create a sense of thrill and joy even in the mind of a traveller who wants to know something about Indian art. India has worked out some of the biggest educational Universities like those at Takṣaśilā Nālandā, Vikramaśilā, and other places. Her sons have produced very wonderful specimens in the field of literature, let it be in Sanskrit, Pālī, Ardhamāgadhī, and the other Prākrits, and the Dravidian languages – including the early picto-phonographic inscriptions of the Indus Valley period. Besides, various schools of religious and philosophical thought have come into being and flourished since the pre-Vedic times down to the present day. The names of Devāpī and Vyāsa, Yājñavalkya and Janaka, Lopāmudrā and Maitreyī, Kṛṣṇa and Bādarāyaṇa, Nārada and Śāṇḍilya, Lakulīśa and Basava, Tirumūlar and Māṇikkavāśagar, Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Nimbāraka, Jñāneśvara, Purandara and Kanaka, shall be ever remembered as torch-bearers to those who are moving on the path of self-realisation.

Early India

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions relate that the early name of India was 'Sid'[1], meaning 'to flow', from which were later on derived the words *Sindhu*, *Hindu*, *Hidu* (in the ancient dialects of Iran – Avestan and Old Persian), *Indos* (Greek), *Indus* and India. The Mahābhārata uses the expression *Vāhīka*[2] for the Indus Valley region and it seems

(1) Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the People and the Land', *Indian Culture*, III, p. 707.

(2) Cf. *infra* under *Vrātyas*.

to be a Sanskrit equivalent of the Dravidian word 'Sid'. The existence of Brāhūī, the large *island* of Dravidian speech in Baluchistan, may help us in assuming that it formed part of proto-India. It is called Drangāni in Sanskrit and Zranka in old Persian and Drangiane or Drangiana in Greek records. Ancient India included the whole of the modern Afghanistan, a fact which is proved by the explorations of Sir Aurel Stein in Central Asia, and of the French School of Archæology in Afghanistan. The Vedic literature discloses the fact that, the provinces of the Bālhīkas (Balkh), the Mahāvṛṣas in the Himālayan region, and the Gandhāras formed part of early India. During the period of Aryanization different designations were given to the various parts of India. Besides Āryāvarta, Manu and the author of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* define the three countries, namely, those of Brahmāvarta, Brahmarṣideśa and Madhyadeśa respectively.[1] The definition of Āryāvarta has differed during different historical periods. Brahmāvarta consisted of the region situated between the Rivers Sarasvatī and the Dṛṣadvatī. Brahmarṣideśa comprised the Kurukṣetra, Matsya, Pañcāla, and Śūrasena. In regard to Āryāvarta Baudhāyana[2] observes that Āryāvarta has Vinaśana to the east, Kālakāvana to the west, Himālaya to the north and Pāriyātra Mountain to the south. He states that, 'some people describe the region lying between the Gangā and Yamunā as Āryāvarta'. According to him, again, the Bhāllavins describe that Āryāvarta consists of the land wherever the black antelope roams. Vasiṣṭha[3] agrees with Baudhāyana but states that, the Vindhya range happens to be the southernmost boundary of Āryāvarta. Yājñavalkya[4] and Hārīta[5] express a similar view point. By implication the above statements show that Āryāvarta comprised almost the whole of India extending from the Himālayas down to Cape Comorin in so far as we find that the black antelope roams both in the North and the South of India. The early Dharmasūtras and Śāstras describe Madhyadeśa (or midland of India) as the region located within the area bounded by Prayāga and Vinaśana and Himālaya and Vindhya[6] respectively. The Purāṇas and some other early works always speak of the two divisions of India *i.e.* Uttarāpatha and Dakṣiṇāpatha, the latter being probably derived from *Dakṣiṇā pada* used in the *Ṛgveda*[7]. The Purāṇas have enumerated the various divisions of India. They divide the entire earth into seven islands (*dvīpas*), and describe the nine islands, amongst which the Bhārata (India) is one[8]. Once they speak of the fifty-six provinces of India. It is designated as Bhāratavarṣa, so named after the great King Bharata, the scion of the Bhārata race. The *Skānda Purāṇa* refers to the seventy-two countries and ninety-six crores of villages (*grāmas*) located in India.[9] All this may indicate that though India was new to the Aryans, it was thoroughly known to the non-Aryans, who were already located here.

---

1. *Manusmṛti*, II, 17 ff; *Bhaviṣya P. Brāhma Parva*, Adh. 7, 60 ff.
2. *Baudhāyana*, I. i, 27 ff; cf. also *Viṣṇudharmsūtra* in this connection.
3. *Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra*, I. 7. 4. *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, I, ; Cf. also *Saṁvarta*, 4.
5. *Hārīta*, 16. 6. *Manusmṛti*, II, 21. 7. *Ṛgveda*, X, 61.8.
8. Indradvīpa, Kaseru, Tāmraparṇī, Gabhastimān, Nāgadvīpa, Kaṭāha, Siṁhala, Vāruṇa and Kumāra. *Cf. Vāmana P.*, 12, 9 ff., etc.
9. *Skānda*, *Māheśvarakhaṇḍa*, *Kaumārikākh*, *Adh* 37, 115 ff.

The Prehistoric Periods

India has passed through the various Prehistoric Ages including the Palæolithic, the Neolithic, the Chalcolithic and the Iron Age respectively. Scholars associate the Negritoes with the Palæolithic and the Austric or the 'Southern Race' with the Neolithic Periods. The Indus Valley civilization is said to belong to the Chalcolithic Age. Evidently this seems to be a period of transition and marks the beginnings of the historic period as we find the emergence of the picto-phonographic inscriptions since then. According to the general belief of modern scholars, the first occupants of the soil of India were the Negritoes ; and the Austric or the 'Southern Race' people next invaded India in two waves. The Dravidians are believed to have later on immigrated into India, and that they were followed by a certain round-headed people of the Alpine race, which is supposed to have come from the 'Pamirs'. The advent of the Aryans (in two waves according to some) is said to have taken place after that.

The early settlers, including the Negritoes and the Austroids, must have brought with them the worship of the *liṅga* (phallus), the tree and some other minor objects. We can with great justification apply to them the remark made by Hopkins in connection with the present wild tribes of India: "Birth-rites, marriage-rites, funeral rites (all of blood), human sacrifice tabu (especially among the Burmese), witch-craft, worship of ancestors, divination, and demonology are almost universal throughout the wild tribes. In many of the tribes dances are a religious exercise."[1] It is just possible that they were totem worshippers. However, it is worth noting that with the dawn of Indus Valley civilization we find that mythology has developed fast and created an independent pantheon of its own.

Peoples and Languages

Modern scholors have tried to identify the various races that are supposed to have immigrated into the soil of India. In the *Census Report* of 1901, Sir Herbert Risley has dealt with the probable racial classification of the various peoples of India. The whole division amounts to this : Dravidian, Indo-Aryan, Turko–Iranian, Scytho-Dravidian, Aryo-Dravidian or Hindustani, Mongoloid and Mongolo-Dravidian or Bengali respectively. However, the recent discoveries made in the Indus Valley sites have changed our outlook regarding the features of the *Dravidians* proper. They should be distinguished from the people of the Negrito race. They were sufficiently fair in colour and neat in limbs. The dark-skinned and snub-nosed Dasyus referred to in the *Ṛgveda* can be identified with the Negrito branch of the Negro race which had already found its way here. They are now found in the Andaman Islands, on the sea-coast of Makran, between India and Persia, in the Malay Peninsula, and in the Philippines. The Yanadis of the Telugu country, the Kurumbas and the Kurubas, the Irulas, the Paniyans, and the Kadirs belong to this early branch. The Santals, Muṇḍas, Bhūmijes, Birhors, Kodas, Larka Kols, Turs, Asurs, Agars, and Korwas located in the hilly jungle tracts on both sides of the Vindhyan range, the Angami Nāgas, the Juangs in the hilly tracts of Orissa, the speakers of Kurku language in the Mahadeo Hills in the Central Provinces, the Savaras and Gadabas in the Oria-speaking districts of Madras, and the Bhils, the Mairs, and the Kolis of Rajputana and Western India-who reside in the western portion of the Vindhyas, in the Aravalli

1. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 535.

range and the Western Ghats, are the descendants of the Austric race. In regard to the Dravidians and the Aryans, we are not in a position to draw a keen line of distinction between them. They were equally fair and strongly built. They are spread over the whole of India. Added to the same are the Scythians, Parthians and others who have also been responsible for the admixture of races in India.

Though the problem of the distribution of races is of an elusive nature, that of language is based on a solid foundation. The Austric languages including the Kolian or the Munda group representing the early Austric race, are spoken wherever the tribes mentioned above are located. The Negritoes have adopted the various languages of the different localities in which they live. According to the *Census Report of* 1901 the total number of Dravidian speaking population is about 60,460,000. The group of Dravidian languages comprises the Tāmil, Kannaḍa, Telugu, Malayāḷam, Tuḷu, Koḍagu, Tuḍa, Koṭa, and Baḍage, out of which the first four alone have their own alphabets, grammar and literature. There is also current a terminology Pañca-Drāviḍa, which indicates a group of five languages: Kannaḍa, Telugu, Malayāḷam, Tāmil and Tuḷu. Some scholars have, however, introduced the Marāṭhī and Gujarātī languages in this group[1]. But we are not in a position to agree with the same especially in view of the data available to us at present. The Malers of the Rājmahal Hills, the Oraons of Chota-Nagpur, the Gonds living in the jungle tract, which lies to the south of the Vindhya Hills, speak the Dravidian languages. In fact the northern group of the Dravidian languages comprises the Gondi (of the Gonds), Kurukh (of the Oraons), Malto (of the Malers), Kandh (of the tribe in the hill tracts of Orissa), Kollami (of a hill tribe in Berar), and Telugu respectively. Best of all, the Brāhūī, the language of Central Baluchistan contains the remnants of the Dravidian language. The Aryan language consists of Sanskrit and the Avesta (with some linguistic peculiarities), the Western Hindi (of the midland), Punjābī and Rājastānī (on the west), Pahārī, (on the north), the Eastern Hindī (on the east), Kāshmīrī, Lahndā, Sindhī, Kacchī, and Marāṭhī (on the south-west), and Bihāri, Bengālī, Assamese and Oriyā (on the east) respectively. During the historical period various Prākrits including Śaurasenī, Mahārāṣṭrī and others came into vogue. The Paiśācī had got its own peculiarities, it having been somewhat of an admixture of the Aryan and the Iranian languages.

1. R. Narasimhacharya, *Karnāṭaka Kavicarite*, I, p. XI.

CHAPTER II

PRE-AND POST-RGVEDIC VRATYAS

Indus Valley civilization-Non-Aryan Tribes in Vedic Literature-Vrātyas in Ancient India—Mohenjo Daro and Bactria-Original name: Vrātyas and not Dravidians—Their antiquity—Mohenjo Daro: A running civilization.

We are still ignorant about the religious history of the people belonging to the Negrito and Austric races. We have shown some indications in the previous chapter. However, we are directly affected by the working of the so-called Dravidians or properly Vrātyas and Aryans. We agree with Prof. R. D. Banerji, and Father Heras, when they say that, the Mohenjo Daro civilization is of a Proto—Indian and non-Aryan character. We also boldly assert that the Mohenjo Daro civilization was a running civilization in so far as it is inclusive of both the Pre-Ṛgvedic and Post-Ṛgvedic periods. It shall also be our contention, that the original home of the Dravidians happens to be India itself, and that the early region of the Aryans must have extended itself from Babylonia up to the borderland of India. However, before entering into the *pros* and *cons* of these problems, let us study the details of the general culture of the proto-Dravidians, who can be more properly designated as Vrātyas, as can be gleaned out from the various finds obtaining in the Indus Valley sites and the literature of the Vedic Aryans. We divide the subject matter into the following heads:

1 The Indus Valley civilization.
2 General culture of the non-Aryans depicted in Vedic literature.
3 Mohenjo Daro and Bactria.
4 The Vrātyas in ancient India.

1. The Indus Valley Civilization

Both the inscriptional and other Archæological evidences throw light on the most marvellous civilization of the ancient Hindus of the Indus Valley period. The Indus Valley zone comprises Harappa, in the Montgomery area of Punjab, Mohenjo Daro, in the Larkhana District of Sind, and twenty-seven other sites distributed in this vast area. It is really a unique instance in the history of India that, the biggest cities of Harappa and Mohenjo Daro, though situated at a distance of about 400 miles from each other, have provided us with materials of an exactly similar type; so much so that, we can postulate that there were thriving one type of people, and under their shelter one monarchic form of Government. Prof. R. D. Banerji expresses the view that the "Dravidians were certainly far more civilized than the Indo-Aryan invaders"[1].

According to Father Heras[2] the inscriptions of the proto-Dravidian period relate that, 'the name of India at the time of the glory of Mohenjo Daro was Sid. There were four great divisions called countries into which Sid was parcelled, *viz.*, Mīnāḍ or the

1. Banerji, *Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India*, p. 19.
2. Heras, *op. cit.*, pp. 707 ff.

country of Fishes, Paravanāḍ or the Country of Birds, Marankoṭinaḍ or the country of the Wood-pecker, and Eḷnāḍ or the Seven Countries. The inscriptions also describe the doings of the following tribes: the Mīnas or Matsyas, who were located both in the Northern and Southern India, the Bilavas, the Eṭkālis, the Kāvals, the Paravas (lit. birds), the Kannanirs, the Velāḷas, the Aḷinas, the Koḷis, the Mūnkālir, the Nalakir, the Nālakālir, the Pareanir, the Nāgas, the Kudagas, and others'.

The Mohenjo Darians enjoyed a monarchic form of Government, one of their kings named Mina being mentioned in the inscriptions. Every tribe had its own banner (*dhvaja*) decorated with its own *lāñcchana e.g.* fish, Nāga, the Linga and others. The inscriptions speak of the system of taxation and other problems of general administration in those days.

Best of all we find that a great development had taken place in regard to the religious and philosophical ideas of the proto-Indians. The Mohenjo Daro Zodiac consisted of eight constellations. The Mohenjo Darians worshipped the Divine Triad consisting of Śiva, Mūruga and Ammā (equivalent of the Sumerian An, Enlil and Ama), the proto-types of the historic Śiva, Kārttikeya and Pārvatī respectively. Besides, the worship of the Nāga (Cobra), the Linga, the ring-stones, and the tree –especially the *pippal* was in vogue. The representation of the three-faced S'iva seated in a Yogic posture is unique indeed! The bronze image of a female dancer may throw light on the early system of Devadāsīs. Gods had their own temples and other paraphernalia. We see in those days the early beginnings of idolatry, zoolatry, and dendrolatry. The people had their own system of ritual, which included the animal and human sacrifices. In matters of philosophy they had formed their own notions in connection with the doctrines of Monotheism, Karma, Rebirth, Asceticism, Yoga and others.

In regard to the other items of civilization we may briefly summarize the position in the truthful words of Prof. R. D. Banerji: 'There were brick-built (with two storeyed buildings with doors and windows), well-planned (with great baths) and highly organised cities (with big citadels surrounding them) of agriculturists and traders at Harappa and Mohenjo–daro. Although copper was in use stone implements were very freely used, and a wonderful craftsmanship was displayed in the production of ornaments of gold, silver, ivory, bone, semi-precious stones (along with imported lapis-lazuli) and even faience. Trading relations with other centres of civilization had been established by finds of Indus Valley 'seals' in Sumeria (lower Mesopotamia) and Elam (Western Persia). The people could build dams across rivers for the purpose of irrigation. They could make very thin jars and vases like egg-shell China, which were decorated with paintings in many colours. The pottery in general is wheel-turned and kiln-burnt. In Baluchistan and Sindh examples of very beautiful vases with magnificent polychrome decorations have been discovered. They know the use of copper and bronze weapons. Yet stone was so freely used that the archæologists regard the early Indus settlers as a people of the Chalcolithic Age-the transitional stage between the Ages of stone and metal. Artifacts (articles made by man) of chert were still being manufactured for occupational purposes. Domesticated animals included the elephant and the camel, as well as the pig, shorthorn and

humped cattle, the buffalo, sheep and the dog. Barley, wheat and the cotton plant were cultivated, and spinning and weaving had reached an advanced stage'.[1] It is also interesting to note that some of the representations on the seals depict the bull-fight. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* corroborates the early vogue of this system (Cf. under *Zoolatry: Bull*).

It should be noted in this connection that, the early tribes of the Mīnas and the Paṇis actively travelled abroad, and spread the indigenous culture of India in early Sumer, Egypt, Crete, Spain, Portugal, England and Ireland. The Phœnicians are none else than the Paṇis, and it is to their credit that they followed their original merchantile profession in other countries, and retained their profession here as the expression *vaṇic* (derived from *Paṇi*) in later literature indicates.

The Matsyas really played a great role in the history of India. They were a great sea-faring race, and they are referred to in the *Rgveda* as one of the ten tribes which had formed a formidable alliance against Sudās, in the other portions of the Vedic literature and the Mahābhārata, and in later history as Mianas, and in modern times as forming part of the Matsya dominion. The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions describe the working of the Mīnas or Matsyas both in the North and South of India. That the method of decipherment of the inscriptions adopted by Father Heras is correct can also be proved by the other corroborative evidence obtained in later literature. Especially, like the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions the early Indian literature also locates the home of the Matsyas in the Harappa and adjoining region, and not the later *Bairāṭ* to which site they seem to have shifted later on. For this purpose we quote the entire portion from our paper contributed elsewhere[2]:

"The history of the Mīnas is one of such problems, the definite location and boundaries of which have not been successfully traced so far. The problem has been made more difficult, especially in view of the fact, that the Matsyas (a Sanskritized form of the word Mīnas) are referred to in many of the Purāṇas as having been located in the midland of India. But, in our opinion, these Purāṇas refer most probably to the later migration of the disjointed forces of the Mīnas (Matsyas) a very few years after their almost total destruction in the Bhārata war. The Bhārata war gave a crushing blow to many of the Vrātya royal families among which that of the Mīnas was one.

There is a peculiar reference regarding the country of the Mīnas in the *Viṣṇudharma Purāṇa*. According to its version the countries of Trigartas, *Mīnas* and the Kaulūtas are situated in the North-Eastern direction of India. To quote the verse itself:

Trigarta-Mīna-kaulūtā Brahmaputrā-ssatigaṇāḥ |
Abhisārās-ca Kāśmīrā-scodak-pūrveṇa kīrtitāḥ ||[3]

As the people of Kashmir also are seen included in this group, it may be safely concluded that, though these countries are said to have been located in the North-Eastern direction, yet it is not impossible that they should also have extended far into the interior portion of the country.

1 R. D. Banerji, *op. cit.*, pp. ix, 9 ff.

2 A. P. Karmarkar, 'Fresh and Further Light on the Mohenjo Daro Riddle,' *A.B.O.R.I.*, XXI, pp. 116 ff.

3 *Viṣṇudharma P.*, Adh. 10, 10.

The Trigartas, in the opinion of scholars, were located round-about Lahore,[1] and evidently the country of the Mīnas must have been adjacent to that of the Trigartas. It is also a fact of immense importance that the word Mīna itself is used instead of the word Matsya thus indicating the actual process of its transformation into a Sanskritized form in the Vedic time and later. The reading of the Indus Valley script by Rev. H Heras, gives the same original reading, namely, Mīna—and nobody may dare accuse him of 'Pre-Judgment' at least at this stage.

The question of the location of the Mīnas (Mīnāḍ in the Mohenjo Daro times) in Northern India becomes of still more easy and accurate understanding, if we are able to describe the boundaries of the forest of the Mīnas which is so often referred to in the post-Vedic literature and the Epics. It is interesting to note at the outset that the *Mahābhārata* mentions two Matsya countries *i.e.* Matsya and Pratimatsya,[2] thus probably referring to the Northern and Southern countries of the Matsyas in the early times. The description of the Southern country of the Matsyas given in Kumāravyāsa's *Bhārata* in Kannaḍa also corroborates our view.

While corroborating the theory that the Mīnas were originally the residents of Nothern India, the *Rāmāyaṇa* also refers to the *Bhāruṇḍavana* or the forest of the Vīra-Matsyas. This forest is described to have been situated to the south of the River Sutlej but to the North of the River Sarasvatī. The passage in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is as follows:

Bharata starts from Rājagṛha, the capital of the Kekayas, and on the way crosses the Sutlej River. Further:

ऐकधाने नदीं तीर्त्वा प्राप्य चापरपर्वतान् ।
शिलामाकुर्वतीं तीर्त्वा आग्नेयं शल्यकर्षणम् ॥ ३ ॥
सत्यसंधः शुचिर्भूत्वा प्रेक्षमाणः शिलावहाम् ।
अभ्यागात्स महाशैल्यवनं चैत्ररथं प्रति ॥ ४ ॥
सरस्वतीं च गङ्गां च युग्मेन प्रतिपद्य च ।
उत्तरान्वीरमत्स्यानां भारुण्डं प्राविशद्वनम् ॥ ५ ॥[3]

The above passage is important from various points of view:

(a) Firstly, it helps us to locate the country of the Matsyas somewhere round-about the Harappa site. The word Bhāruṇḍa (or even Bheruṇḍa, Bheranḍa, Bharuṇḍa, *etc.*) is also the name of Śiva.[4] We doubt whether it can mean the same forest styled as Nyagrodhāraṇya in the *Skānda Purāṇa* in which Śiva is said to

1. N. pr. eines Volkes, Welches in hautigen Lahore Wohnte, Hemachandra's *Abhijñāna-chintāmaṇi*, 958—cf. *Böethlingk und Roth, Sanskrit Worter in buch.*

2. Cf. *Mahābhārata, Bhīṣmaparva, Adh. 6,* in which a detailed description of the countries and people of India is given.

3. *Rāmāyaṇa*, II, 71, 3-5.

4. Wilson's interpretation, Cf. Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary.*

have played the fierce Tāṇḍava dance along with Kālī.[1] Peculiarly enough, the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions describe that an image of Śiva in his *Tāṇḍava* posture was installed in a forest.[2] Then, is it possible that this is the same image referred to in the passage of the *Skānda Purāṇa*, which according to the version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* happens to be the forest of the Northern Vīra-Matsyas? For such a conclusion the fact that images of Śiva in a Tāṇḍava posture are found in the Indus Valley sites is probably enough to support our view.

(b) The description of the forest of the Matsyas in the above passage gives us a direct clue in regard to the fact, that, it is not impossible that the country of the Mīnas was lying somewhere round-about the forest (probably to the north), but adjacent to the country of the Trigartas, situated to the north of the Sutlej River. This would bring us exactly somewhere near the Harappa site, which is at a distance of about fifty miles from the Sutlej River.

(c) One would be surprised to find that the forest Bhāruṇḍavana assumes altogether a different name in the post-Vedic age *e.g.* Dvaitavana. The *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* speaks of a Matsya king Dhvasan Dvaitavana.[3] The *Mahābhārata* locates the Dvaitavana to the North of the River Sarasvatī, which fact exactly corroborates our statement. The almost common use of the word Dvaitavana instead of 'Bhāruṇḍvana' may also help us to place the people of the Rāmāyaṇa even at a period earlier than that of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, though we are awaiting more substantial materials for this assertion. Further, the use of the word Dvaitavana also indicates the origin of the doctrine of Devotion as being in the land of the Mīnas, and that it first originated in the worship of Śiva, the Supreme Lord of the universe.

2. Non-Aryan Tribes in the Vedic Literature

Introductory.

A study of the cultural activities of the Dāsas, Dasyus, Asuras, and of the various non-Aryan tribes mentioned in the Vedic literature reveals to us a new phase in the history of proto-India. All the above terms denote the same Proto-Indian people, who are styled as Vrātyas later on. The non-Aryan tribes which are generally referred to in the *Ṛgveda* are: the Pārāvatas, the Pakthas, the Alīnas, the Bhalāṇas, the Viṣāṇins, the Śivas, the Matsyas, the Paṇis, the Bekanāṭas, and the Kīkaṭas with their king Pramaganda.[4] The *Atharvaveda* makes a mention of the Mūjavants, the Mahāvṛṣas, the Balhikas, the Gandhāris, the Aṅgas, the Kīkaṭas or the Magadhas, the Kirātas, etc. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[5] refers to the South Indian tribes: Pulindas, Mūtibas, Andhas, Śabaras, and Puṇḍras. The Epics and the Purāṇas describe the doings of the Māhiṣakas, Vānaras, Nāgas and other tribes. Some of the names of the Dāsas and Dasyus occurring in the *Ṛgveda* may be enumerated as follows: Śambara, Ilibiśu, Dhuni, Cumuri, Pipru, Varcin, Śuṣṇa and others. The term *Asura* was applied by

1. Cf. न्यग्रोधारण्यसुक्तं ते पञ्चोपो निर्ममे किल ॥
   उत्कटताण्डवं काल्या सार्कं संदर्शयिषन् ॥
   Skānda P. Māheśvara Kh. Aruṇācala Māhātmya, 2, 2. 66.
2. Heras, *Sardesai Commemoration Volume, p.* 234.
3. *Śatapatha Br. I, vii, 3-8.*
4. Cf. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index.*
5. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 18,

2

the Aryans to some of the Rgvedic gods. But later on, the expression connoted a 'demoniacal being,' and became equivalent to the expressions like Rākṣasas, Daityas, Dānavas, etc. The epics and the Purāṇas prominently describe the names of the following Asuras: Rāvaṇa, Bali, Kaṁsa, Jarāsandha, Naraka, Mahiṣāsura, Hiraṇyakaśipu, and others.*

Black and White Dasyus.

It shall, however, be our contention that, the Dāsas, Dasyus, or the Asuras described in Vedic literature included amongst them the indigenous Vrātyas or the so-called proto-Dravidians, and the Negrito and the Austric races who had immigrated into India later on. Evidently the curt references made to these people in general *i.e.* snub-nosed, black-skinned *etc.*, must have had first and fore-most a direct bearing on the Negrito and Austric people; and they were made applicable to the fairer race of the Vrātyas, mainly because they were also non-Aryans, and much more so as they happened to be the makers of the Indus Valley civilization. We shall, however, discuss the problem later on.

The Vedic Aryans have given an absolutely fantastic description of the non-Aryans. The following instances will elucidate the point.

Dasas and Dasyus.

The Dāsas and Dasyus are depicted in the *Rgveda* as denoting enemies of a demoniacal character. They are referred to as human foes of the Aryans. They are described as being of black-skin,[1] as against the brown-colour (Hiranya) of the Aryans.[2] The Dasyus are mentioned as 'noseless' (anās),[3] misfeatured, and of hostile speech (mṛdhravāk).[4] The Dasyu is said to be killed at pleasure, or made a slave.

Asuras.

Unlike the Dāsas and the Dasyus, the 'Asura in the *Ṛgveda* is 'a term of praise.' The Asura Varuṇa is noted for sovereignty (kṣatra), universal monarchy (sāmrājya), and above all occult power (māyā). Varuṇa is essentially 'Asura Māyin'.[5] The term Asura is also applied to Indra,[6] Agni,[7] Savitṛ,[8] and even Rudra,[9] whose *asuriyam* is propitiated as Śiva. During the later period the term Asura connotes a 'demoniacal being.' The other non-Aryan tribes mentioned above are also spoken of in an equally curt manner.

Their King and dominions

The *Ṛgveda* always refers to the forts (*puraḥ*) and the clans (*viśaḥ*) of the Dāsas. Śambara is said to have been in possession of ninety,[10] ninety-nine,[11] and hundred[12] forts whose strongholds are referred to as of metal (*āyasī*). Forts with hundred walls (*śatabhuji*), or citadels of stone (*aśmamayī*), or mud-bricks (*āmā*), are mentioned[13]. These citadels

1. *Rgveda*, I. 130.8; IX. 4. 1.
2. *Ibid*, I.35 10.
3. *Ibid*, V. 29. 10.
4. *Ibid*.
5. *Ibid*. I. 24. 14; I. 25. 8.
6. *Ibid*, I. 54.3.
7. *Ibid*, IV, 2,5; VII, 2.3.
8. *Ibid*, I, 35.7.
9. *Ibid*, 5, 42, 11 ; 2. 6,
10. *Ibid*, I. 130. 7.
11. *Ibid*, II. 19. 6.
12. *Ibid*, II, 14. 6,
13. *Cf. Vedic Index*.

are the same as those formed at Harappa[1]. In the later period Asuras like Jarāsandha, Bali and others are described to have ruled over the major provinces of India.

The Asuras enjoyed a monarchical form of government. The various Brāhmaṇas relate that the Asuras had originally a king, and that the Devas had none. This was stated to be one of the reasons why the Devas were defeated in every battle-field. Then it is described how the Devas elected a king, and how on account of which they were able to defeat the Asuras.[2]. The above passage throws a wonderful light on the high state of civilization the Asuras had attained. We know for certain that the Mohenjo Darians had their own system of kingship. Further they had their own strong well-built cities. Hence the above instances may easily point out the wonderful civilization of the proto-Indians.

Their rites.

As distinguished from the Aryans the non-Aryans are described as having their own system of ritual. One of the Ṛgvedic stanzas specifically states:

> " Around us is the Dasyu, without rites, void of sense, with different rites, (*anyavrata*) not following Manu.
>
> " Baffle, thou slayer of the foe, the weapon which this Dāsa yield "[3].

The non-Aryan tribes are generally designated as *akarman* (riteless),[4] *adevayu* (indifferent to the Gods-Aryan ?),[5] *avrata* (lawless),[6] *ayajvan*[7] (not sacrificing), and *a-brahman* (without Brahman).[8]

The Mohenjo Darians had their own system of priesthood and ritual, and peculiarly enough they were non-sacrificers (fire). The above stanza describes that the Dāsas and others had their own rites and observances.

Their God

The non-Aryans are designated as *Śiśna-devāḥ*, which according to us refers to God Śiva who is represented nude in the Indus Valley period.[9] Further they seem to have been the worshippers of the Divine Triad. One of the *Ṛgvedic* stanzas alludes to the three Gods, namely Yātudhāna (who is Pumān), the female (Strī), and the Mūradevas with bent necks (who happen to be the same as Mūruga or Murugaṇ (Kārttikeya) of the proto-Indian times). The above stanza probably refers to the Divine Triad of the Vrātyas. It is also worth noting that the later Asuras and Rākṣasas are described

---

1. Wheeler, R. E. M., ' Harappa 1946; the Defences and Cemetery, *Ancient India*, 3, p. 83.
2. Cf. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, I. 14. The exact passage is as follows:
देवासुरा वा एषु लोकेषु समयतन्त तान्स्ततोऽसुरा अजयन् देवा अब्रुवन्नराजतया वै नो जयन्ति राजानम् करवामह इति ॥ तथेति ॥
3. *Ṛgveda*, X, 22. 8,
4. *Ibid*, X, 22. 8.
5. *Ibid*, VIII, 7.11,
6. *Ibid*, I, 51-8; VI. 14.3; IX. 41.2.
7. *Ibid*, VII. 6. 3,
8. *Ibid*, IV. 16. 9,
9. Cf. under the *Linga*.

as being worshippers of Mahādeva and the Liṅga. The *Ṛgveda* further refers to a three-headed and six-eyed Dāsa. This is but an implied reference to the three-faced figure of Śiva represented on the Mohenjo Daro seals. The reference to *Ahi* Vṛtra as Deva is indicative of the early prevalence of serpent worship.

Priesthood

The Asuras seem to have possessed their own institution of priesthood. The Bhṛgus who seem to be reformist Aryans actually acted as the priests of the Asuras. Further the cult of the Vrātyas throws light on this problem[1]. The Mohenjo Darians had their own priesthood. And the above instances clearly point to the original character of the Asura civilization in this connection.

System of Burial

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* clearly refers to the round burial mounds prepared by the Asuras both in the eastern and other directions[2]. These were evidently the precursors of the Stūpas of the Buddhist period. The *Cchāndogya Upaniṣad* describes the early system of burial prevalent amongst the Asuras. The following passage from the Indra-Virocana dialogue concerning the search of the Ātman is significant:

"Now Virocana, satisfied in his heart, went to the Asuras and preached that doctrine to them, that the self (the body) alone is to be worshipped, that the self (the body) alone is to be served, and that he who worships the self and saves the self, gains both worlds, this and the next.

"Therefore they call even now a man who does not give alms here, who has no faith, and offers no sacrifices, an Asura, for this is the doctrine (Upaniṣad) of the Asuras. They deck out the body of the dead with perfumes, flowers, and fine raiment by way of ornament, and think they will thus conquer the world."[3]

The system of the burial of the dead was prevalent amongst the later Dravidians also. The various Megalithic tombs spread over through the whole of India and the outside world show how the Vrātyas practised the system on a large scale during the early period. Evidently the above passage clearly refers to the system of burial which was in vogue amongst them.

Human Sacrifice

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* narrates that the practice of the rite of human sacrifice was prevalent amongst the Paṇis. It depicts one of the scenes wherein the Paṇis took part in the act. The Paṇis were evidently a non-Aryan tribe of Ṛgvedic fame. However, we shall discuss this problem in detail under *Human Sacrifice*.

Language and Literature

The *Ṛgveda* specifically describes the Paṇis, Dāsas and Dasyus as bein *Mṛdhravācaḥ* (of hostile speech). Further the Paṇis in addition are described as Grathins.[4] The expression Mṛdhravāk certainly refers to the different form of speech current amongst the non-Aryans. In regard to the other expression Grathin, Keith and

1. Cf. under *the Vrātyas*.
2. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1. 5. e.g. *yā asuryāḥ prācyās-tvad ye tvat parimaṇḍalāni (smaśānani kurvate)*.
3. *Cchāndogya Upaniṣad*, VII, 8. 4-5.
4. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 6. 3.

Macdonell express the view that it is of uncertain meaning.[1] Hillebrandt opines that the epithet refers to the continuous flow of a speech which is not understood.[2] However, both these expressions throw light on the art of speech and writing of the pre-Vedic Vrātyas. The proto-Indians used to speak a language different from that of the Aryans. And their innumerable inscriptions prove beyond doubt their capacity of writing also. Evidently the word Grathin must be referring to the early compositions (from *grath*) of the Paṇis, who themselves were an early non-Aryan Vrātya tribe. The *White Yajurveda*[3] mentions seven Āsurī meters *e.g.* Gāyatrī Āsurī, Uṣṇih Āsurī, Pankti Āsurī, etc.

Some other Features

There are also some other features which throw light on the early culture of the Asuras. The Asuras are described as great maritime people-which is just indicative of the maritime activities of the Indus Valley people, whose ship stands represented on the seals. They knew the science of engineering, sculpture and architecture. Maya is supposed to be their greatest exponent on the art of building. In fact, 'almost every important ruin in India is credited to the generic Asura comprising such specific groups as Yakṣa, Gandharva, Pannaga, and Rākṣasa.'[4] The Asuras are always described as the off-spring of Diti-a fact which points out the matriarchal type of family they enjoyed. The Asuras are described as being great fighters. The *Mahābhārata* refers to an Asura Phalanx, which was known by Bhīṣma.[5] Besides the airial cars are said to have been used by Rāvaṇa and Indrajit. We have already stated above the instance of the bull-fight described in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, immediately after the fashion of the Mohenjo Daro representations.

Cattle-raids

The *Ṛgveda* throws light on the early vogue of cattle-raids current amongst the non-Aryans. We quote the entire passage from a Paper contributed by us elsewhere:

The Paṇis seem to have played a very mighty role in the cultural history of India. Though designated by the Ṛgvedic Aryans as niggardly, riteless (*avrata*), non-sacrificing (*ayajña*), as people observing different rites (*anya-vrata*), still they have made a mark as the most heroic and cultured race in the history of India. In fact when the Vedic Ṛṣis speak of the cattle, the mist, storm and darkness, they always introduce the personalities of Indra and his enemies Vṛtra, the Dāsas, the Paṇis, etc. In fact by destroying either Vṛtra, or the Paṇi, Indra is said to have made the waters flow and released the cows, which were kept hidden in the caves.

As has been pointed out elsewhere, the Paṇis, who could be identified with the other non-Aryan tribes were people who knew the art of composition and writing (they are called grathins)[6], and they possessed great iron fortresses. They used to sell the Soma. It is said that they also used to steal away the cows of the Aryans. In fact the Vedic singers speak in the following terms:

When Indra and the Aṅgirasas desired it, Saramā found provision for her off-spring.

1. Cf. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, I, p. 471.
2. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, I,89.
3. Weber, *White Yajurveda*, I, LX.
4. *Mahābhārata*, III, 173, 1220, 1206 (B).
5. *Ibid.* VI, 696 (B).
6. *Ṛgveda*, VII,6. 3.

Bṛhaspati cleft the mountain, found the cattle: the heroes shouted with the kine in triumph.

Ṛgveda, I, 32. 18.

Thou Indra, won back the kine, hast won the Soma; thou hast let loose to flow the seven Rivers.

Ibid. 32, 12.

The men together found the Paṇis hoarded wealth, the cattle, and the wealth in horses and kine.

Ibid. 83, 4.

Nay, the event of the Paṇis' lifting away of the cows is allegorized in the Dialogue of Saramā and the Paṇis.[1] Saramā, the bitch of the Vedic gods, was specially sent to trace the cows. The dialogue indicates how a long time must have elapsed before the tenth Maṇḍala was composed.

It is really wonderful that the *Varāha Purāṇa*[2] mentions the same tale of Saramā and the Paṇis–though the Paṇis are designated as Rākṣasas there.

The instances quoted above need not at all create an impression that the Paṇis were in any way robbers. To us it seems that the Paṇis must have shifted away the cows mainly to show their defiant attitude towards their inimical Aryans. The *Mahābhārata* describes one such instance at the hands of the Kauravas as against the king Virāṭa of the Matsyas. The details of the *Ghoṣayātrā* in the *Mahābhārata* fully indicates the above view point.

The inscriptions in Southern India throw further light on this problem. While describing the hero-stones (vīragals) in Karnāṭaka, Rice observes: 'By far the most numerous were cattle-raids, especially in border districts. Though sometimes the work of organised bands of robbers, *many were hostile demonstrations against an enemy.* The cows of a village belonging to another ruler were driven off from the grazing-grounds in the intervening woodlands as an act of defiance. The cowherds often gave up their lives in defence of their charge or some village hero, fired with indignation, would sally forth with a few followers and recover the stolen cows, only to die of his wounds on his return. Such an act was reckoned as patriotic, and the man's family was provided for with a grant of rent-free land. In more daring cases the villages themselves were pillaged and the women molested. Memorial stones, rudely sculptured to represent the incidents of cattle-raids and to record the grants, made in connection with them are found in all parts'.[3]

The above statement gives a new vision even in regard to the doings of the early tribe of the Paṇis as against the Aryans. The Paṇis were a mighty merchant tribe and their daring deeds are recorded in the history of the Phœnicians abroad, and the Vaṇics of India. It is really surprising that the trading class of India-the third of the four castes-was named after the great trading tribe of the Paṇis in proto-India.

Conclusion

Thus all the above data clearly shows that the various non-Vedic tribes described above were none but the descendants of the early makers of the Mohenjo Daro civilization. Some scholars have identified the Asuras with the Assyrians, the Dāsas with the

1. *Ṛgveda*, X, 108.
2. *Varāha Purāṇa*, Adh. 16, 8.
3. Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 178.

Dahæ of the Caspian steppes, the Paṇis with the Parnians[1], and so on. But all these tribes indicated the same people who can properly be called as the proto-Vrātyas. The various features of their civilization clearly prove their pre-Aryan character.

3. Mohenjo Daro and Bactria

While examining the coins of the Kushano-Sasanian period, I came across various representations of Śiva and the Bull or Nandī. They possess a close resemblance to those obtaining on the seals discovered at Mohenjo Daro, Harappa, and other proto-Indian sites. Bactria or Bactriana, which is more popularly known as Bālhīka, Vāhīka or Bāhīka in ancient Indian literature, 'is an ancient country of Central Asia, lying to the south of the river Oxus, and reaching to the western part of the Paropmisan range or Hindu Kush. Balkh, the 'Mother of cities', was once the seat of the Zoroastrian religion, and the great Prophet is said to have died within the precincts of its walls. Even much more interesting is the fact, that, it is connected with the most important movements of the Indo-European races. It was a great cultural centre, and at one time the rival of Ecbatana, Nineveh and Babylon. The country was under the suzerainty of many Dynasties since the time of Medes. Further the country has been referred to by Yuan Chwang, the various Arabian travellers, Marco Polo, and others. It is a place of great archæological interest. Besides the monitory legends, several Bactrian inscriptions have been recently discovered, among the most important of which are the 'Taxila' copper-plates. Further the Peshavar vase, the Manikyala Cylinder, the Bimaran vase, and the Vardak are of absorbing interest.'[2]

Both the data in connection with the Kushano-Sasanian coins and the early references in ancient Indian literature respectively, make us strongly believe that the Bālhīkas had adopted the religion of the Mohenjo Darians in those hoary times. The problem becomes much more interesting when we come to know that the Aryan immigrants had made it their residential centre at one time. And if the Aryans treated the Bālhīkas with scant courtesy, it would naturally follow that the Bālhīkas were non-Aryans. Added to this we find that the Bālhīkas were worshippers of Rudra-Śiva since the ancient times (cf. *infra*).

It is proposed to deal here with the various problems arising out of the main issue of the Kushano-Sasanian coins or those of the Sasanian Prince-Governors of Bactria, who bore the title *Vazurg Kushan Shah* or *Shahan-shah*.

Balhikas in early Literature

The Bālhīkas are referred to for the first time in the *Atharvavēda* as a non-Aryan tribe. Therein the fever Takman is asked to go away to the region of the Bālhīkas, Mūjavants and Mahāvṛṣas.[3] The exact stanzas are as follows:

"Go Takman, to the Mūjavants, or far away to the Balhikas passing (us) by, O friend, devour the Mahāvṛṣas and the Mūjavants. We point out to Takman these and those alien regions.

1. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, I, 94.
2. Cf, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, under *Bactria and Balkh*.
3. *Atharvaveda*, V. 22. 5. 7. 8. 12.

"Takman, along with thy brother Balāsa, with thy sister Kāsikā and with thy nephew Pāpman depart to that foreign people".

Thus it becomes absolutely clear that the Mujavants, the Mahāvṛṣas and the Bālhikas were non-Aryan people, against whom Takman with his brother is wished away. It is significant to note here that the Bālhīkas are spoken of as being located beyond the country of the Mūjavants.

The *Yajurveda* and its *Brāhmaṇas* suggest that the mountain where Rudra resided and wandered about was the Mūjavān.[1] The Mūjavants as a people are referred to in the *Ṛgveda*.[2] Moreover, Takman and other diseases, with the aid of which Rudra slew the people, are 'said to have been born in the land of the Mūjavants and the Mahāvṛṣas, and sojourned among the Bālhikas.'

The next important reference regarding the Bālhīkas is made in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. It describes that, 'Agni is declared to be gentle name of Rudra whom the Eastern people call Śarva and the Bāhīkas Bhava and Paśūnāmpati, Lord of cattle. All these names except Agni, are said to be ungentle'.[3]

Best of all the *Mahābhārata* refers to the Bālhīkas or Vāhīkas or Bāhīkas. It uses these three expressions denoting the same people. It describes the country of the Vāhīkas thus:

"There where the forest of the Pīlus and the five rivers Śatadru, Vipāśā, Irāvatī, Candrabhāgā, and Vitastā, and which have the Sindhu as their sixth flow there in those regions is situated the province, called the Ārattas distant from the Himavant....The celestial, the ancestral manes and Brāhmanas never accept gifts from fallen persons (Vrātya) from those that are begotten by Śūdras upon women of other castes and from Vāhīkas who never perform Yajñas".[4]

Paṇini, the early Buddhist texts, and other allied literature make a mention of the country of the Vāhīkas.

Thus the Vāhīkas, who were located in a narrower part during the period of the Atharvavēda, seem to have enlarged their dominions later on and occupied the whole of the Indus Valley region. But it should be noted in this connection, that, the early peoples of the Mohenjo Daro region were already wiped off from the scene, when the Bālhīkas were reigning supreme in the territory.

Kushano-Sasanian coins

We have already observed how the Bālhīkas were worshipping Rudra during the period of the *Brāhmaṇas*, and perhaps before. The representations on the Kushano-Sasanian coins[5] act only as a step further to show that Rudra-Śiva still held his sway during a far later period also *i.e.* c. 230-438 A. D.

The coins contain various representations of Śiva and the Bull in different poses. Coin 7 b. contains the image of the hump-backed Bull with the three-faced figure of Śiva standing in front of it. Śiva is holding the rope in his right hand, and a trident in his left. 9a. consists of a similar representation, the Triśūla borne in the hand

1. *Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā*, 3. 6; *Taittirīya Saṁ.*, 1. 8. 6. 2.
2. *Ṛv.*, 10. 31. 1.
3. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1. 7. 3. 8.
4. Cf. *infra* under *Vrātyas*.
5. cf. *Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India*, No. 38, 'Kushano-Sasanian Coins'.

being represented in a more clear and vivid manner. 9b. and 15c. have the representations of Śiva with one face. In 15c. Śiva is dressed in the same fashion as that of the Sasanian Governors. 15a. contains the three-faced figure of Śiva. In 15b. is shown the three-faced figure of Śiva with the head-gear of the Mohenjo Daro type placed on his head. It is also worth noting that a bunch of flowers is shown as arising from the middle of the two horns. 19b. consists of a figure of Śiva with only one face.

The kings also are represented as bearing the horned head-gear on their head. 31d. consists of the figure of the king bearing on his head the two horns and a bud placed in between. No. 38 consists of the two horns joined together with a bud placed in between, but having no contact with the horns themselves. Coin 39 contains a complete crescent, and the bud or bunch of flowers is deleted altogether.

Mohenjo Daro Representations

The representations of Śiva, the bull and the horned head-gear on the Kushano-Sasanian coins become much attractive when we find that they look as mere reminiscences of the old Mohenjo Daro types. One of the Mohenjo Daro seals depicts the three-faced figure of Śiva, the proto-type of the historic Śiva, seated in a Yogic posture, and with a horned head-gear placed on his head.[1] Sometimes the horns and the middle portion are shown and at others a bunch of flowers is represented as issuing from the two horns situated on either side. Sir John Marshall described the above as a pair of horns meeting in a tall head-dress.[2] Mackay, while commenting on one of these representations, calls it as 'of two horn-like objects between which there appears to be a spike of flowers'.[3]

Later Phases

Thus what appears on the Kushano-Sasanian coins is nothing but the later development of the old representations obtaining on the seals of the Mohenjo Daro period. The three-faced figure of Śiva on the Mohenjo Daro seals clearly points out how the images of Maheśa-mūrti existing at Elephanta and at other places in India owe their origin to the above. The idea of the Hindu Trinity consisting of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, or that of Dattātrēya must be evidently of a later time. That the three-faced figure originally denoted Śiva is also corroborated by its appearance on the Kushano-Sasanian coins. It is worth noting that Bactria is a country of pre-Vedic origin and it has remained absolutely unaffected by the later Hinduism as it developed in India.

The representation of Śiva with the Bull probably reminds us of the close association of the Bālhīkas and the Mahāvṛsas (which means literally, 'a big hump-backed bull') in the Vedic period. The Mūjavants, the Mahāvṛsas and the Bālhīkas were people who were closely connected with each other. Eventually the bull must have played a significant role in the cult of the Mahāvṛsas. As the Bālhīkas as a nation were nearer to that of the Mahāvṛsas, they must have joined together these two, namely, Śiva and the Bull.

1. Cf. Heras, 'The Plastic representation of God amongst the Proto-Indians', *Sardesai Com. Vol.*, p. 224; Marshall, Vol. I, pl. 12. No. 17.
2. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and Indus Civilisation*, I, p. 52.
3. Mackay, *Further Excavations*, I, p. 335.

The Kushano-Sasanian coins prove beyond doubt another factor, namely, how the so-called head-gear of Śiva must have developed itself into the Crescent placed over the head of Śiva in the later period. The development must have taken place as follows: first with the three prongs; next with two horns and a bunch of flowers issuing out of them, in the middle; thirdly, with a bud issuing out of them, but placed in a bifurcated position; and finally, a complete crescent, with a natural deleting of the bunch of flowers or the bud.

Bactria and Mohenjo Daro

That the Bactrians or Bālhīkas and the Mohenjo Darians were two different tribes belonging to two different countries originally, is very well proved by the fact that the Matsyas, who are the same as the Mīnas of Mohenjo Daro and the Bālhīkas are referred to as being located in separate provinces in the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda* respectively. The Bālhīkas evidently resided in a province beyond the Hindu Kush. Eventually the reference in the *Mahābhārata* in regard to the occupation of a vaster dominion by the Vāhīkas should really point to a later period than that of the Vedas.

The *Atharvaveda* clearly points out that the Bālhīkas were a non-Aryan people. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* indicates that they were the worshippers of Rudra in his Bhava and Paśupati forms. The Kushano-Sasanian coins have given us a further clue, namely, that the Bālhīkas must have adopted the religion of the Mohenjo Darians far back in the pre-Aryan period—the representations on the coins themselves acting as reminiscences of the older civilisation.

4. The Vratyas in Ancient India [1]

It was really Rajaram Ramkrishna Bhagawat who first drew the attention of the scholarly world towards the non-Aryan character of the cult of the Vrātyas. In fact it was he who asserted that, " the graphic description of the Brāhmaṇa clearly establishes that the word Vrātya originally denoted some non-Aryan tribes. As these non-Aryan tribes had a covering for the head to keep the Sun off and were clad in white garments, with black borders, and had a silver currency and painted shoes, they cannot be said to have been savages.... When we come down from the Brāhmaṇa to the Sūtra we find that the society of the Vrātyas acknowledged the three grades of the educated, the high-born and the wealthy, which perhaps formed its upper classes, and which at times, with its masses, made attempts to overwhelm the followers of the Vedas. The plan of assimilation by conversion was perhaps suggested to the Aryans by the necessity of expansion."[2] Thus, the fact that this early institution had its own merits is clearly proved by the above statement.

But, partly on account of the lack of Purāṇic studies then, and partly on account of the fact that the excavations at the various sites of Harappa and other centres were made rather after the twenties of the present century, the question of the identification remained unsolved. In the meanwhile, Dr. A. Berriedale Keith tried to prove the Aryan character of this early institution.[3] But the Purāṇic and the Epic data

1. This paper was read before the Fifth Indian History Congress, Hyderabad-Deccan, 1941.
2. Bhagawat, *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, Vol. XIX, p. 363.
3. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, II, under 'Vrātya'; also *J. R. A. S.*, 1913, p. 155.

throws immense light on the nature of this institution-it being, in our opinion, the earliest organization of the Proto-Indians pervading through the whole of India—and to nullify the effects of which the Aryans started a parallel institution of the Cāturvarṇya, and later on invented a new method of conversion by the introduction of the Vrātya-stomas. We shall now enter into the details of the problem.

Their early Occurrence

The term 'Vrātya' is of a very ancient origin. The earliest reference made to it is in the *Atharvaveda*, wherein the Vrātya is exalted to the position of the Supreme Being Mahādeva. Sāyaṇa interprets the word as meaning 'fallen.' In the *Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra* the word is derived from the root 'vrata' (a vow), and the Vrātya is described as Śrotriya or religious mendicant who has learnt one recension of the Veda-a faithful following of his vows.[1] *Baudhāyana* interprets it as 'a son of an uninitiated man.'[2] According to *Manusmṛti*[3] and *Viṣṇudharma Purāṇa*[4] the word means 'one who has let go the proper time for the sacrament of initiationship' (*sāvitrī-patitaḥ*). The *Mahābhārata* classes the Vrātya with the off-scourings of society such as incendiaries, poisoners, pimps, adulterers, abortionists, drunkards, and so on.[5] Further in the *Mahābhārata* and other works the Vrātya is included among the mixed castes *e. g.* son of a Śudra and a Kṣatriya woman or an illegitimate son of a Kṣatriya.[6] Böhtlingk and Roth express the view that the word means 'a pious vagrant or a wandering religious mendicant.'[7] The meaning of the word has now survived in Marāṭhī language, indicating 'naughty, unmanageable and playing pranks.'

It should be noted in this connection, that, in the Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā the Vrātya, Puṁścalī and Māgadha are included in the list of victims at the Puruṣamedha (human sacrifice).[8]

Cult of the Vratyas

The cult of the Vrātyas had a unique system of its own. Further, the cult that is represented in the *Atharvaveda* and later literature exhibits some connecting links with the healthy civilization of the Mohenjo Daro times. This point has also been greatly stressed in his recent work by Dr. Bhandarkar.[9] If this be so, then it definitely indicates something of a pre-Aryan institution, which was only modified and made as their own by the Aryans in later times.

Their God

In the Hymn on the Eka-vrātya, it is emphatically stated that the Eka-vrātya was the Supreme Being of the Universe. It is described:

---

1. *Āpastamba*, II, 37, 13-17.; *S. B. E.*, II, pp. 118-119.
2. *Baudhāyana*, *Dh*. S, I. 8.
3. *Manusmṛti*, II, 39.
4. *Viṣṇudharma P. Third Khaṇḍa, Adh*, 233, 72.
5. *M. Bh.*, V. 35, 46, 1227.
6. *M. Bh. Anuśāsana P.* 83, 10. *Cf.* Monier Williams, *Sk. Dictionary*.
7. Böhtlingk and Roth, *St. Petersberg Lexicon*, VI, 1503.
8. *Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā*, XXX, 8 ; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, iii, 4, 5, 1.
9. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*.

"He roused Prajāpati to action. Prajāpati beheld gold in himself and engendered it. That became unique, that became excellent, that became devotion, that became fervour, that became truth : through that he was born. He (Eka-vrātya) grew, he became great, he became Mahādeva. He gained the Lordship of the Gods. He became Lord. He became chief Vrātya (Eka-vrātya). He beheld the bow, even that bow of Indra. His belly is dark-blue, his back is red. With dark-blue he envelopes a detested rival, with red he pierces the man who hates him, so the theologians say."[1]

The above passage is important from various respects. In the early Mohenjo Daro inscriptions the Supreme Being of the Universe is described as Śiva. He alone is the creator, preserver and destroyer of the Universe.[2] Eventually in the Eka-vrātya Hymn also He assumes the role of being the creator of the Universe. The Purānic tradition always designates Śiva as '*hiraṇya-retas*' (possessing golden semen). And surprisingly enough, here it is said, that, 'He roused Prajāpati to action—who later on beholds gold in himseif and engenders it.'

Further the word Mahādeva used in connection with Eka-vrātya, the proto-type of Śiva, clearly proves the supremacy of Śiva as a personal God or the Īśvara of later times. It was only in imitation of this word Mahādeva that the Vedic Aryans seem to have innovated expressions like Mahendra, etc.

The three-fold character of Śiva in the Mohenjo Daro times becomes evident also from his three-faced representations on some of the seals.[3] A reminiscence of the same is also to be found in the caves of Elephanta. Evidently, it was only later on in the Upaniṣadic period that the prominence of Śiva is minimised by the introduction of two more Vedic Gods *i.e.* Brahmā and Viṣṇu, who occupy the position of creator and preserver of the Universe, respectively.

Further, the Eka-vrātya imbibes all the characteristics of Rudra in so far as he is said to possess a bow, etc.

Eka-vratya and Pumscali

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions speak of the Divine Triad consisting of Śiva, Mūruga and Ammā respectively.[4] Śiva was the proto-type of Rudra-Śiva, and Ammā that of Pārvatī. Mūruga or the later Kārttikeya was their son.

The *Atharvaveda* also gives some clue in regard to the early notions in respect of the Divine Triad. In Book xv, it is said that Śraddhā was the Puṁścalī of the Eka-vrātya. This statement wonderfully throws light on one of the Ṛgvedic passages, wherein is made a reference to the Divine Triad. The Ṛgvedic passage is as follows :

---

1. *Atharvaveda* XV, I,
2. Heras, *Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions*, Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. V. Pt. I, pp. 1-39.
3. *Cf. infra.*
4. Heras, *op, cit.*, pp. 16 ff.

"Slay the male demon (*Yātudhāna*), Indra! Slay the female joying and triumphing in arts of magic (*Māyā*).

Let the *Mūradevas* with bent necks fall and perish, and see no more the sun when he arises."[1]

As seen above the Triad of Mohenjo Daro consisted of a male, a female and a son respectively. Eventually all these three are mentioned here, the last expression *Mūradevāḥ* being a corrupted form of the Dravidian word Mūrugan, an early name of of Kārttikeya. Moreover, it is of great importance that the word '*Strī*' used in this passage seems to be the same as Puṁscalī used in connection with the Eka-vrātya or Śiva in the *Atharvaveda*. The explanation of the fact why such a word meaning a harlot is used, we may say that, it is partly due to the sheer ignorance of the Vedic Aryans, and partly to their hatred towards this cult of their aliens. That the expression Puṁscalī indicated the Mother Goddess of the Mohenjo Daro times may become clear from what has been said by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar on this point.[2] This misunderstanding regarding the real nature of Ammā is carried even to the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, wherein Ambikā is stated to have been the sister of Rudra.[3] It was, however, only in later times—probably after a complete fusion of the Aryans and the Proto-Indians in regard to race, customs and manners, that a proper signification of the deities was made.

Ekavratya : A Yogin and an Ascetic.

The *Atharvāṇic* hymn throws further light on the problem. It is said:

"For a whole year he stood erect. The Gods said unto him, why standest thou, O Vrātya? He answered and said, let them bring my couch. They brought the couch for the Vrātya. The Vrātya ascended the couch. The hosts of Gods were his attendants, solemn vows were his messengers, and all his creatures his worshippers."[4]

Nay, he also possessed Yogic powers, *i.e.*, "of that Vrātya there are seven vital airs, seven downward breaths."[5] We need not enter into the details here.

The Apparel.

The hymns also speak about his apparel—"the day was his Uṣṇīṣa (head-gear), yellow the Pravartas (ear-rings), Kalmali the Maṇi or jewel."[6]

All the above description is of a unique importance, especially because it is absolutely in keeping with what is contained in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and representations. As observed above, there is a representation of the three-faced figure

1. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 104. 24.
2. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, pp. 42-43.
3. *Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā*, III, 58; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II, 6, 2, 9.
4. *Atharvaveda*, XV, 3.
5. *Ibid*, XV, 2.
6. *Ibid*, XV, 3.

of Śiva on some of the seals found at Mohenjo Daro and other sites. It is designated as the Paśupati of Mohenjo Daro.[1] As Father Heras has described it :

"God is represented as seated on a throne surrounded by animals......The image of Āṇ is represented in the male form, completely nude with a prominent *ūrdhva-liṅga*. His legs are not crossed as usual in images of Buddha, Mahāvīra and other ascetics, but in such a way as to have the soles of the feet touching each other. Round his waist there is a zone or ribbon. Hanging from the neck he wears a huge necklace that takes a triangular shape with the point below. Eleven armlets are round his arms. Three of them in the wrist, in the elbow and the shoulder are larger than the rest. His hands rest upon the knees. His face looks emaciated as befits a Yogi, and apparently, three-faced. The most remarkable feature of this image is the head-gear about which says Sir John Marshall, "covering his head is a pair of horns meeting in a tall head-dress. But what appears like horns and head-gear are a trident."

In the description given in the *Atharvaveda* also, a couch and a head-gear are referred to. In fact, the Eka-vrātya, having stood erect for one year (*i.e.* having practised penance for one year), seats himself on a couch. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has already referred to the fact that the Uṣṇīṣa mentioned in the above hymn must be the same which is represented on the Mohenjo Daro seals.[2] Further the couch mentioned in the hymn is the same as the throne on which Śiva is made to be seated. Best of all, the representation on the seal is that of a *Yogin*, which fact exactly suits with what is described in the hymn. It is worth noting that Śiva is depicted as a prince of Yogins *par excellence* in later tradition also.

His various Manifestations.

In the *Atharvaveda*, xv, 5 a description is given of the various manifestations of the Eka-vrātya. Evidently they (with the exception of Rudra) are all the names of Śiva as transcribed or translated by the Aryans in later times. The hymn details :

" For him they made the Archer Bhava a deliverer from the intermediate space of the eastern region. Neither Śarva, nor Bhava, nor Īśāna slays him who possesses this knowledge, or his cattle, or his kinsmen. They made Śarva, Paśupati, Ugra, Rudra, Mahādeva, Īśāna as the deliverers from the other regions."[3]

Their Order

Both the Book xv of the *Atharvaveda* and the later literature have given ample details in regard to the working of the institution of the Vrātyas. It is true that the references in the Sūtra literature are made casually, namely, at the time of their conversion into the fold of Aryanism. Still they are of great importance even as reminiscences of the old tradition that prevailed since the pre-Aryan times.

Dress and Customs

The *Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa* gives some details about the dress and customs of the Vrātyas. It is said :

1. Heras, '*Plastic Representation of God amongst the Proto-Indians*', *Sar. Com. Vol.*, p. 224 ; Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization*, I, p. 54; Mookerji, *Aryenne du Christianism*, p. 52 (Paris, 1935); Mackay, *The Indus Civilization*, p. 70.
2. D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, pp. 41 ff.
3. *Atharvaveda*, XV, 5.

"The Vrātyas are those who wear a turban (*uṣṇīṣa*) on their heads, which they put on one side. They carry a whip (*pratoda*) in their hands and a small bow (*jyāhroḍa*) without arrow, by which they make depradations and trouble people. They ride in waggons (*vipatha*) with bamboo-sticks without cover and drawn by horses and mules. They wear on their bodies white garments with black borders (*kṛṣṇaśa*) or garments made of wool with red strips or sheep-skins (*ajina*). They use *Niṣka*."[1]

The *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa*,[2] on the other hand, gives some further interesting details. "It is said that they beat the unworthy of correction. Their leader or householder wore a turban, carried a whip, a kind of bow (*jyāhroḍa*), was clothed in white and black (*kṛṣṇa-valakṣa*) and owned a rough waggon covered with planks (*phalakāstīrṇa*). The others subordinate to their leader had garments with fringes of red, two fringes on each, skins folded double, and sandals (upānaha).[3] The leader wore an ornament called Niṣka (coin according to Bhagawat).[4] The Sūtras, however, remark that the sandals of the Vrātyas were of variegated colour *e.g.* black, hue."

The *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa*[5] further describes that "though unconsecrated they spoke the tongue of the consecrated. They were not to practise agriculture and commerce, nor to observe the rules of Brahmacarya." In the *Atharvaveda* it is described that the Vrātyas used to drink wine (surā).

There is something of peculiar interest in all this. The dress of the Vrātyas happened to be the same as that of the Eka-vrātya as seen above. It should be noted, however, that all that is said here may not be applicable to the original cult (*i.e.* that the Vrātya was not to observe rules of Brahmacarya etc.), still there is much that is comparable with the original civilisation of the Mohenjo Daro people. The cart (vipatha) seems to be the same as used in the Mohenjo Daro times[6]-and the reminiscences of which were to be found in the country of Magadha in the time of Lāṭyāyana. Further, the *uṣṇīṣa*, as remarked above, was evidently the head-gear of of Śiva and his followers. Again Karṇa, while detesting the dress of the Vāhīkas pointed out that the people of the Pañcanada wore blankets and a pair of skins.[7] The Vāhīkas had occupied the country of the Mohenjo Darians long after the time of the *Ṛgveda*. Still the reminiscences of the older civilisation seem to have remained there. Added to this, if we just have a look into one of the Mohenjo Daro seals, wherein is depicted the scene of the seven victims made ready for the sacrifice, we shall have a clear idea about the dress of the people.[8] Therein we actually find the people wearing shoes, a long robe, and a head-gear on one side.

The Niṣka of the Vrātyas is a reminiscence of the one worn by Rudra.

As Non-Sacrificers (Fire)

There is a hint in the *Atharvaveda*, which points out that the Vrātyas originally belonged to a non-sacrificing race like the Paṇis, who are also described as non-sacrificers in the *Ṛgveda*. It is said :

1. *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa*, 17.
2. *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, XVII ,1 ff.
3. *Ibid*, XVII, 1, 114.
4. Bhagawat, *op. cit.*, p. 361.
5. *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, XVII. 1, 19.
6. *Archæological Survey of India*, 1926, 27 Pl. XXIII, d.
7. *Mahābhārata*, VIII, 44. 7.
8. Mackay, *Further Excavations at Mohenjo Daro*, II. pl. XCIV, 431.

"The man, to whose house, when the fire has been taken up from the hearth and the oblation to Agni placed therein, the Vrātya, possessing knowledge comes as a guest, should of his own accord rise to meet him and say, Vrātya, give me permission. I shall sacrifice. And if he gives permission he should sacrifice, if he does not permit him, he should not sacrifice."[1]

This ordination probably leads us directly to the non-Aryan origin of the cult of the Vrātyas. We know for certain that it was the Aryans who introduced the cult of fire-sacrifice. And evidently this must not have existed in the pre-Aryan times. In the above hymn particularly, though a complete deification of the Vrātya has taken place at the hands of the Aryans, the vestiges of the old notion have remained. That the ancients did not perform the Agnihotra becomes perfectly clear from one of the passages of the *Kauśītaki Upaniṣad*[2]. Father Heras, while commenting on this passage, rightly observes, "the *Kauśītaki Upaniṣad* tells us that 'the wise men of old (*pūrve Vidvāṃsaḥ*) never performed the Agnihotra.' Now this Agnihotra is a *Ṛgvedic* sacrifice daily performed by the Brahmins before sun-rise. Therefore the wise men of old who never performed this sacrifice evidently belong to an age prior to that of the *Ṛgveda*. They are the old Dravidian learned people who never performed the Agnihotra, because they did not know even its name."[3]

Their Order

It seems that solemn vows were to be taken by everybody who belonged to the cult of the Vrātyas. The *Atharvāṇic* hymn (xv, 3) directs that solemn vows were required to be taken. Thus it is described, "the hosts of Gods were his attendants, solemn vows were his messengers, and all his creatures his worshippers."

Vratya as a Guest

The Vrātya had attained a particular prominence in society as an ascetic, who, when he visited the house, required to be treated with reverence. The Vrātya hymn directs :

" So let the king, to whose house the Vrātya who possesses the knowledge comes as a guest, honour him as superior to himself. So he doth not act against the interests of his princely rank or his kingdom."[4]

"Let him to whose house, who possesses this knowledge, comes as a guest, rise up of his own accord to meet him and say, Vrātya, let it be as thou pleasest. Vrātya as they wish so let it be."[5]

Further the Vrātya was to be allowed to remain even for an unlimited period. He was to be worshipped as a deity.

---

1. *Atharvaveda*, XV, 12.
2. *Kauśitaki Upaniṣad*, II, 5.
3. Heras, *The origin of Indian Philosophy and Asceticism-An Historical Introduction*; A. P. Karmarkar, *Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka*, p. XL.
4. *Atharvaveda*, XV, x.
5. *Ibid*, XV, xi.

Caste System

The *Pañcaviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa* specifically states that the Vrātyas were divided into Arhants and Yaudhas. The *Atharvaveda* also very finely corroborates this by saying that the "Kṣatriya-hood (Rājanya) and Priesthood sprang from the Eka-vrātya." Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has rightly laid his finger on this by saying that this was the earliest origin of the caste system in ancient India, and that it was out of this that the Aryans built their own fabric of the Cāturvarṇya.[1]

Their later Divisions

Thus it is clear that originally there were only two divisions of society. But owing to the incessant working of the Aryans against this cult, the general populace also had begun to treat all those who belonged to this cult as somewhat 'degraded.'[2] This becomes evident from the account given about them in the *Pañcaviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa*. It describes their four divisions as follows:

I. *Hīna* (Libidinous) were those who deteriorate themselves by staying in the Vrāti settlement, and who neither practise Brahmacarya nor pursue agriculture or trade. They are Kaniṣṭhas. Among them were the Arhants and the Yaudhas.[3]

II. *Gārāgirs*: These were the swallowers of poison to whom the commoners' victuals are like Brāhmans' food, who though not consecrated, speak the tongue of the consecrated and yet call what is easy of utterance difficult to utter.[4]. As Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has pointed out, this conception seems to have given rise to the notion that Śiva was a swallower of poison—on account of which he is designated as Nīlakaṇṭha.[5]

III. *Śamanīca-Meḍhra* are those "whose Meḍhra hangs low through control of passion." They were Jyeṣṭhas. They resided in the Vrāti settlement.[6] These were, in my opinion, those who practised Yoga.

IV. *Nindita*: This class consisted of people who had become outcasts for some reasons.

Their identification

Thus the early institution of the Vrātyas was one homogeneous whole—an institution which was revered and reared up by the indigenous peoples of India. It was a unique institution with a definite deity, divisions, and a definite procedure to follow. The institution seen especially in the light of the Mohenjo Daro civilisation as forming its background, may appear vaster in its magnitude and achievements. Evidently it must have acted as a source of inspiration to many, and the proto-Indians must have felt proud of possessing it, as can be seen from Book xv of the *Atharvaveda*, which is but a mystic glorification of the Eka-vrātya. Hence, the word *Vrātya* must have been derived from the word *Vrata* as Āpastamba would have it. If this be so, then the Ṛgvedic *Vrata* also may convey some sense of borrowing from this original system of the

1. D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
2. *Cf.* also *Vedic Index* II, under 'Vrātya.'
3. *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, XVII, 52-3.
4. *Ibid.*, XVII, 1-9.
5. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
6. *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, XVII, 41.

non-Aryans. But mainly on account of the working of the Aryans the term *Vrātya* was given a different turn–and it conveyed in later times something very opposite of the meaning that it conveyed in the earlier period.

Still the problem remains hotly discussed especially in regard to the identification of the people who practised this cult. We propose to deal here with the *pros* and *cons* of the problem.

Earliar Views

(i) *Bhagawat's view*: The late Rajaram Ramakrishna Bhagawat opined that the Vrātyas denoted some non-Aryan tribes. But about their location, he pointed out that, "the Sūtra holds that the chariot used by Vrātyas was the same that was in use among the eastern people. The custom of giving away the dress of the enfranchised Vrātya to a Brāhman of the province of Magadha in case a Vrātya were not found at hand to receive it, pretty conclusively establishes the original home of the non-Aryans. The Vedic tradition at least as embodied in the Sūtra of Lāṭyāyana points to the province of Bihar (Eastern India) as being the cradle of the non-Aryan race."[1]

(ii) *K. Chattopadhyaya* proposed that, "from the mention of Vedic gods in the Bogaz köi treatises there were several arrivals (between 2000 and 1500 B. C.) of the Aryan people in Asia Minor at the same time when other Aryan tribes entered India from Central Asia and became known as Vrātyas."[2]

(iii) *F. W. Hauer* indicated that the Vrātyas were ecśtasies of Kṣatriya class and fore-runners of the Yogins.[3]

(iv) *F. Charpentier* proposed that they were the early worshippers of Śiva.[4]

(v) *D. R. Bhandarkar* expresses his opinion that the Vrātyas belong to the same race as that of the Mohenjo Darians, but that they must have belonged to the race of the Magas of Persia.[5]

(vi) *A. B. Keith* proposes a still diffierent theory by saying that these were Aryans outside the sphere of Brahmanic culture. He has summarised his own views in the *Vedic Index*. He says, "that they were non-Aryans is not probable, for it is expressly said that though unconsecrated they spoke the tongue of the consecrated. They were thus apparently Aryans.... The Sūtras mention their Arhanta and Yaudha corresponding to the Brahmanical Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya. Further they were allowed to become members of the Brahmanical community by performance of the ritual prescribed, which would hardly be so natural in the case of the non-Aryans."[6]

However, before entering into the details, we shall try to find out whether the Purāṇic evidence throws any light on the problem.

Puranic Data

The Purāṇic evidence seems definitely to indicate that the cult of the Vrātyas was a common property of all the Dravidian nations in ancient India.

1. Bhagawat, *op. cit.*, p. 364.
2. Chattopadhyaya, *Calcutta Review*, May, 1924, pp. 287 ff.
3. Hauer, *Die Anfänge der Yogapraxis* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 11 ff.
4. Charpentier, *W. Z. K. M.*, 23, 151 ff., 25, 355 ff.
5. D. R. Bhandarkar, op. *cit.*, p. 48.
6. *Vedic Index*, II, p. 343.

The *Mahābhārata* gives a description of the people of the land of the five Rivers, after it was occupied by the Vāhīkas in the post-Ṛgvedic period:

"There where the forests of the Pīlus and the five Rivers Śatadru, Vipāśā, Irāvatī, Candrabhāgā, and Vitastā, and which have the Sindhu for their sixth flow, there in those regions is situated the Province, called the Ārattas distant from the Himavant.... The celestial, the ancestral manes and Brāhmans never accept gifts from fallen persons (Vrātya), from those that are begotten by Śūdras upon women of other castes and from Vāhīkas *who never perform Yajñas*."[1] It also speaks of the fair (*gaura*) women of the Vāhīkas, their worship of the demoness (evidently the Mother Goddess), and of the pottery (Mṛṇmaya and Kāṣṭhamaya) in use amongst them.[2]

The above description is of far-reaching importance especially because the statement is made in connection with a locality where the whole of the Mohenjo Daro civilisation at one time flourished. It should be noted in this connection that the Vāhīkas are classed with the Vrātyas and are further designated as non-sactificers. The Vāhīkas must have evidently adopted the customs noted in the *Mahābhārata*, which are in apt accordance with what is noted in connection with the Vrātyas.

Next, the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*[3] narrates the event of the conquests of Sagara, and while doing so points out how the various tribes of the Śakas, Pahlavas, Yavanas, Kāmbhojas, Pāradas, Māhiṣakas, Dārvas, Colas and Khaśas went to Vasiṣṭha for rescue mainly through the fear of destruction, and how it was that they were rescued by the famous sage after having turned them into Vrātyas.

It is also worth noting that the *Mahābhārata* designates even the Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis as Vrātyas. The exact passage is as follows:

Vrātyāh saṁkliṣṭa-karmāṇah Prakṛtyaiva ca garhitāh
Vṛṣṇyandhakāh katham Pārtha pramāṇam bhavatā kṛtāh ||[4]

Thus the Purāṇic data points out that the early peoples of the Mohenjo Daro, the Māhiṣakas, the Colas, the Ambaṣṭhas and the Andhaka-Vṛṣṇis were styled as Vrātyas. Added to this, the *Atharvaveda* and other allied literature have already thrown light on the non-Aryan character of the Māgadhas.

Evidently the Purāṇas do indicate the all-pervading nature of the Vrātya cult. It is clear that it was not confined to any one tribe or locality as some of the scholars would try to prove.

Various Theories examined

In the light of the above it can be very well seen how the theories enunciated by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and others are unconvincing. We do not wish to enter into the details of Chattopadhyaya's view, especially because the evidence at our disposal does not allow us to hold such a view point. Further, the views put forth by Bhagawat, Hauer and Charpentier must remain as partial solutions of the problem.

---

1. *Mahābhārata*, *Karna Parva*, *Adh*. 37, Vs. 31ff. In Vs. 32 they are styled as Vrātyas *e.g.* 'एवं शीलेषु व्रात्येषु वाल्हीकेषु दुरात्मसु.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Brahmāṇḍa P.*, *Madhyabhāga*, *Adh*. 63, *Vs*. 138 *ff*.
4. *Mahābhārata*, *Droṇa P.*, *Adh*. 143, 17.

Dr. Bhandarkar maintained that the Vrātyas could be identified with the Mohenjo Darians. But his opinion[1] in regard to the identification of these people with the Māgadhas or the earlier (according to him) Magas of Persia is not at all satisfactory. Merely because the Māgadha happens to have been mentioned as a priest of the Eka-vrātya, it cannot be concluded at once that the Vrātyas can be identified with the Māgadhas alone, and much less that they bear some connection with the Magas of Persia. As we are going to show it the original country of the Kīkatas derived its later name Magadha on account of the name of the king Pramaganda, who ruled over the territory in the end of the Ṛgvedic period.[2] It is also worth noting that the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* itself, which is mainly responsible for building up the theory, maintains the tradition indirectly by referring to the expressions maga, madaga, and madaṅga, etc. Moreover, the institution seems to be of a later date rather belonging to the period of Kanishka as the learned Savant Sir R. G. Bhandarkar would suggest it.[3]

Dr. Keith holds that the Vrātyas were of Aryan origin. But the Purāṇic data available to us, along with the details of the cult of the Vrātyas as indicated in the *Atharvaveda* and later literature, do not allow us to accept any such conclusion.

Original Name of Proto-Indians : Vrātyas and not Dravidians

The Vedic Aryans used to designate the non-Aryans as Dāsas, Dasyus, Dānavas, Asuras and later on Vrātyas, and Vāhīkas respectively. Some modern scholars call the makers of the Indus Valley civilisation as proto-Dravidians. According to Father Heras the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions speak of the country of Sid, which is just indicative of the land watered by the later Sindhu or Indus. This province was designated as Vāhīka in the Mahābhārata and other works. Vāhīka is derived from the root *Vah*, 'to flow', and, therefore, it naturally connotes the same sense as above. However, scholars like Caldwell applied the word Draviḍa to the non-Aryan inhabitants of India. The non-Aryans had their own language, namely, the so-called Dravidian which has spread over the whole of Southern India and partly in the North. Caldwell also proposed that the expression *Draviḍa* is derived from the original *Tiramilar* (later Tiramiḍar). Father Heras agrees with him, and observes that the expression means 'children of the sea'.[4] He has also traced the various changes effected in connection with the word both in the Western and Eastern literature. Herodotus applies the expression Termilai to the prehistoric inhabitants of Greece before the arrival of the Aryan Helleni. The Iberians of Spain call them as Draganes. The Etruscans designate them as Tirreni. In France, England and Ireland the Druids, who were not Celts, but the priests of the ancient nation prior to the Celts in those countries, received the name Drasidæ, Dryidas, Druidæ, Droatæ and Derwydd

1. D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, *p.*, *48.*
2. *Ṛgveda*, III, 53.14.
3. R. G. Bhandarkar, (*Collected Works*, Vol. IV) *Vaiṣṇavism*, *Saivism*, *etc*, p. 220.
4. Heras, 'The Original Name of the Proto-Indians', Summaries of Papers : *The Eleventh All India Oriental Conference*, 1941, pp. 123 ff.

respectively.[1] Indian authors themselves use the expressions, Draviḍa (*Manu*, *Mahābhārata*), and Dramiḷar (Tārānāth). It should be noted that the earliest of the references mentioned above belong to the sixth century B. C. Is it possible that the designation of the non-Aryans may be Tiramilar as proposed by Caldwell ?

In our opinion the modern expression 'Tāmil' should really come to our rescue. If we just march backwards to the early period, we shall be able to interpret it still better. The Mahābhārata makes a mention of the *Draviḍa* armies, drawn from the country which is now designated as Tāmil. The word is capable of a different derivation altogether e.g. *tamas* + *iḷā*. We know that the expression *iḷā* meaning *Pṛthvī* or 'the world' is current since the Ṛgvedic period. And if the expression is derived as above it means 'nether world' or the Pātāla in which Bali, whose wife was Vindhyā, is said to have been resting. The Tāmils have remained where they were since originally. The expression attained popular currency in the West, mainly because, it was the people of the Tāmil land who had commercial intercourse with the West on a large scale. Herodotus (484–425 B. C.) even speaks of Pandyon, the King of Madura, going to the continent from Crete and settling himself at Athens.[2] In view of this everything Indian was identified with that of the *Druids*, who happened to be also part and parcel of India in general.

The main expression by which the non-Aryans were popularly known is 'Vrātya'. As we have observed above, it was applied to all the non-*Aryan* tribes of India including the Vāhīkas or Bālhīkas. Even the God of the Vrātyas is designated as *Eka-vrātya*, the *One Supreme Lord of the Universe*. In view of all these we suggest that the expression *Vrātya* may be applied with a better sense instead of '*Dravidian*' in the case of these early people. Even the expression *Pañca-Drāviḍa*, indicating a people belonging to the Kannada, Tāmil, Telugu, Tuḷu and Malayāḷam regions is of a much later date.

Their Antiquity and Early Culture

In a paper contributed by me to the Benares Session of the All India Oriental Conference, 1943, I have suggested that the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions should

1. *Ibid.*

Father Heras has given all the details in a Tabular form.

We are giving the main contents of the same below.

India	Ancient Tāmil Vocabulary	Tiramiḍar
	Sanskrit Inscriptions of South India and Tārānāth's *History of Buddhism in India*.	Dramiḷar
	Manu, XI, 43–44 ; *Mahābhārata*.	Draviḍa
	Caldwell, pp. 8–10—Name of those who speak	TāmilTamilar
Greece (484–425 B.C.)	Herodotus, I. 173 ; VII. 92	Termilai
Spain (6th cen. B.C.)	Avienus, *Periplus*, *VIII*, 197	Draganes
France (330–400 A.D.)	Ammianus Marcellinus, *XV*, 94	Dravidæ
British Isles (4th cen. B.C.)	Aurelius Victor, De Cæsaribus, *IV*. 2.	Drysdæ
(100–44 B.C.)	Cæsar, De Bello Gallico, and *passim*	Druidæ
	Name of the Druids in Irish	Druad
	" " in Welsh	Derwydd

2. *Herodotus*, I, 173; VII, 92.

give us a better meaning provided they are read in early Vedic Sanskrit. I have always believed in the method adopted by Father Heras in deciphering the inscriptions, but not to the same extent in the language applied by him. In my opinion, the ancient Sanskrit is capable of placing before us a better Dravidian vocabulary. We know it definitely that there were some reformist Aryans like the Bhṛgus, who are said to have acted as the family priests of the Asuras. Hence it is not impossible that these Bhṛgus also could have handled the problem of inscriptions in those early times. The cranialogical evidence also allows us to place the Aryans in the Indus Valley region. We still stand by the suggession made by us five years ago. Keeping this in view we have tried to give a broad idea of the early cultural life of the most ancient people of India. For the purposes of our study we have kept in view the early Vedic literature and the various conclusions arrived at by Rev. Kittel, Rev. Caldwell and Father Heras.

The Vedic literature speaks of the Vābīkas, Mahāvṛṣas, Mūjavants, Gandhāris (in the north-west), Matsyas (from *Dr. Mīna*), Śivas, Pāñcālas (from *Dr. āḷ*, man), Paṇis, Viṣāṇins, Alinas, Kīkaṭas (in the mid-land and east), the Pulindas (from *Dr. Puli*, tiger), Mūtibas (from *Dr. mun + dibbas* – Triparvatas), Andhas, Bekanāṭa[1] (nāṭa derived from *Dr. nāḍ*, province) (in the south), and other peoples. The two rivers Sindhu (probably derived from *Dr. Sid*, to flow), and *Sadānīrā*[2] (derived from *Dr. nīr*, water), are referred to. The expression *Dakṣiṇā pada* referred to in the *Ṛgveda* (cf. *supra*) is indicative of the later expression Daksiṇāpatha (*patha* from *pada*). We get some idea from the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda* in regard to the religious ideas of these early people *e.g. apām perum*[3] (derived from *Dr. Per*, 'Lord of waters'), *Śiva*[4] (from *Dr. Śivan*, red), ambā (from *Dr. Ammā*, mother), *Mūradeva*[5] (from *Dr. Mūruga*, Kārttikeya), and *Śiśnadeva* (nude god, Śiśna derived from *Dr. Śunni*, phallus).[6] The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* speaks of God Nārāyaṇa (from *Dr. nīr*, water)[7]. The *Mahābhārata*[8] speaks of *eḍūkas* (from *Dr. elu*, bone) or the early Stūpas and the Megalithic tombs of the Buddhists and non-Aryans respectively. The expression *pur*, a townlet or fort, is derived from the Dravidian expression *ūru*. Rev. Kittel, in his Introduction to the Kanarese-English Dictionary has given a long list of Sanskrit words originally derived from the Dravidian expressions. We propose to enumerate a few of them, here: *Mandira* (temple, from *Dr. Mane*), *Paṭṭa*, *Paṭṭaṇa* (town, from *Dr. Paḍu*) *Kūṭa* (a house), *Bhilla* (a mountaineer, from *Dr. Billu, Bil*), *Muni* (a sage, from *Dr. Mun*), *Naṭa-Nāṭaka* (from *Dr. Nāḍu*), *Maru* (Mountain or rock, from *Dr. Maraḍi*), *Malaya* (mountain, from *Dr. Male*), *Pāli* (village, from *Dr. Palli*), *Kanaka* (gold, from *Dr. Keṅka, Ken*), *Muktā* (a pearl, from *Dr. Muttu*), *Āḷ* (men, as in Pāñcāḷa), *Mīn* (a fish, from *Dr. Min*), *Eḍa* (a kind of sheep from *Dr. Eraṭa*) and others. The expression *Nāga* (a tribe) is evidenly of Dravidian character.

1. *Ṛgveda*, VIII. 16, 10.
2. *Śatapatha, Brāhmaṇa*, XIII, 5, 4.11.
3. *Ṛgveda*, X, 36.8.
4. *Ibid*, 10, 92.9.
5. *Ibid*. 104.24.
6. *Ibid*, VII, 21. 5; X, 99.3.
7. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, X, 1.
8. *Mahābhārata Vanaparva* (Bom. Ed.), *Adh*. 193, 65 and 67.

The above data indicates that the early non-Aryans had spread themselves through every nook and corner of India. The expression Bhilla shows how the early man must have spent his nomadic life in the forests. These early people had their own definite ideas regarding god, religion and all other objects required for the pursuits of a primitive man. In course of time, we know how the territory of the non-Aryans comprised all the land lying between Balkh in the North-West and Cape Comorin in the South. It shall be our object in the final chapter to show how the early notions and practices of the Proto-Indians regarding the Divine Triad, the horn-crown, trefoil decoration, the burial system and others had spread in the different provinces of India and the other countries abroad. In the meanwhile, we propose to deal with the problem of the priority of the Mohenjo Daro civilization as compared to that of the Aryan.

Mohenjo Daro: A Running Civilization

All that we have said in the preceding pages about the Indus Valley civilization has made the problem more difficult of solution rather than otherwise. The whole position becomes involved and of a complicating character when we bring to our mind the various similarities that the Indus Valley people possess with the early non-Aryan peoples described in the Vedic literature, the early peoples of Sumer, Egypt, Iberia and other countries. Efforts have been made by various scholars either to associate the Indus Valley culture with that of the Assyrians or with that of the post-Ṛgvedic Aryans-especially by those who are Aryan-minded. It was Sir John Marshall and later on Prof. R. D. Banerji and Father Heras, who tried to show the proto-Dravidian character of the wonderful civilization. Even these scholars have commonly agreed that that the proto-Dravidians also must have been of a foreign origin. However, it is high time now for scholars to put a stop to this line of thinking. For if we keep in view the earliest of the rock-system obtaining in the Deccan *plateau*, wherein the first of man could have originated and survived, then, with the aid of all the other corroborating evidence we shall be in a better position to postulate that all that has happened in pre-Vedic times and partially afterwards is of his making.

The Aryans also have partly belonged to this land since the most ancient times From the region of Babylon onwards through the Paropmisan range down to Cape Comorin, we find the working of two peoples, namely, the Aryan and the Vrātyan. The Negrito and the Austric races happen to be intruders. In the Indus Valley region itself, side by side with the indigenous people, there seems to have been the superimposition of the Aryans also during the Ṛgvedic period. We have decided to deal with the above problems in the final chapter of this Volume. In the meanwhile, we have decided to solve the question : how far will it be correct to state that, the Indus Valley civilization was a running civilization, running from the pre-Vedic period onwards through the Ṛgvedic down to that of the *Atharvaveda*.

The Early Aryans

The problem of the early immigration of the Aryans into India is still being handled by various scholars without reaching any final solution. We have perfectly believed in the theory of the eminent Savant Max Müller enunciating an Asiatic home for the Aryans, with a slight modification, namely, that their home must have spread itself between Babylon

and the borderland of India. In the Ṛgvedic period the Aryans must have also spread themselves into the interior of India up to the banks of the River Sarasvatī. The 'Battle of the Ten Kings', or more popularly known as the *Dāśarājña*, shows how Sudās had to face the Matsyas also, who were evidently of a pre-Vedic date.

Side by side with the proto-Indians or Vrātyas, the Aryans also have played a great role in the early history of India. The Aryans had their own language Sanskrit and their own cultural outlook of life. They seem to have been by nature aggressive, because, we find that in course of time they have Aryanized almost the whole of India and all the countries in the Western hemisphere.

The *Ṛgveda* happens to be their earliest composition. It describes the doings of the Āryas or Aryas. Even so the Avesta speaks of the Airya or Ariya and their region *Airyaman vaējanh*. In no other language and literature of the world do these expressions occur. But with the aid of a newly invented Comparative Philology and a comparative study of the social, political and religious institutions, various Western and Eastern scholars tried to establish three different stages of the Aryan migration, namely, those of the Indo—Aryan, or—Germanic, or—European, Indo-Iranian and Indian respectively. We shall discuss the *pros* and *cons* of this problem in the second Volume. In the meanwhile, we shall try to show how the Vrātyas were actually prior to these Aryans, and how their culture survived for a while even after their immigration into India.

For doing this, we have to keep before us a brief account of their culture. The Aryans spoke the Sanskrit language. They were fire-worshippers (*agni*). They performed sacrifice (*yajña*). Though they adored Nature Gods we do not find any instance of image worship amongst them. They always speak of little towns (*pur*, *grāma*), and of little kings, little Sabhā and Samiti, and of a pastoral stage of life. The Ṛgvedic mythology was still in the making. And if we keep aside the *Puruṣa*, the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, and the *Nāsadīya Sūktas*-which are of a later date, we find that they were only making a beginning in the region of philosophy. The Vedic Aryans enjoyed a patriarchal type of family. Their hymns were first designated as *brahman* (*lit.* 'a prayer'), which word has given rise to three expressions Brāhmaṇa, Brahman (Supreme Being), and Brahmā (Creator of the universe), respectively.

Their superimposition

These were the people with whom the indigenous people of India had to deal. If the Aryans have come into contact or conflict with them, it evidently means that they must have lived in a common region for a good long time. The cranialogical data of the Indus Valley period supports our view. Actually four types of skulls are discovered in the Indus Valley sites: Proto-Australoid, Mediterranean, Mongoloid and the Alpine-the first two being dolicho-cranial, the second mesati-cranial, and the fourth brachy-cranial. Thus the Dravidian or properly Vrātya and the Aryan are represented by the Dolichocephalic and the Brachycephalic skulls obtaining simultaneously in this region. The Aryans were slowly trying to merge themselves among the Vrātyas on both the racial and cultural grounds. We know that the Bhṛgus were reformist Aryans *par excellence*. They acted as priests of the Asuras. They also seem to have been

partly responsible for the invention of the picto-phonographic script and for the development of the art of magic and witch-craft amongst the Asuras. Thus the region of the Indus Valley happened to be a common ground for the working of both the Aryans and the Vrātyas.

Indus Valley a running Civilization

It is in this sense and with this specification that we say that the Indus Valley civilization was a running civilization as it pre-supposes both the pre-Ṛgvedic and post-Ṛgvedic periods in the history of India. The Indus Valley civilization seems to have come to a close for varied reasons : a massacre of the non-Aryans on a large scale ; an earthquake ; and a heavy flood. All these three are a possibility.

The *Ṛgveda* shows a keen knowledge of the civilization of the Indus Valley people. To quote a few instances: the Matsyas or the Mīnas, Śiva, the Śiśnadevas, (nude images of Śiva), the Mūradevas (Mūruga or Kārttikeya), the three-headed and six-eyed Dāsa, the Paṇis, *Ahi* Vṛtra, and the other factors of the forts, citadels, the ritual and others of the Asuras. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* refers to the round burial mounds of the Asuras. The *Atharvaveda* refers to the cult of the Eka-vrātya, the Aśvattha tree, the divine nature of the serpent, Kāma, exorcism, magic and folk-lore. All these point to the non-Aryan character of the *Atharvaveda*, which is also called *Bhṛgu-saṁhitā*. The work is a clear indication of the reformist tendencies of the Bhṛgus. All this clearly indicates that the Aryans had come into contact with a living people, who were enjoying a culture different from their own. If we can believe in the theory of the migration or the spread of their culture from the North-West into the various parts of India, we shall have also to attribute a priority to these people. Later on, the Aryans have been describing them for a very long time-a fact which indicates their existence side by side with that of the Aryans. The main problem would be: When did this civilization really come to a close?

The legend of Manu and the Flood should really come to our help in this connection. We have already shown the location of the Mīnas in the Indus Valley region. And as we shall see later on while dealing with the problem of Zoolatry, an actual flood must have taken place in the different parts of India. The legends of Manu and the Fish, the over-flooding of Dwārakā immediately after the close of the Bhārata war, and that of Paraśurāma darting his arrow against the Ocean, and the consequent securing of the land which is known as the *Paraśurāma-bhūmi*, are important indeed! There is another important event in connection with the River Sarasvatī. The river is addressed to in the masculine as *Sarasvān*, to show its mighty flow from the clefts of the Himālayas. Surprisingly enough we find that this is referred to only as a brooklet (*saraḥ*) in the post-Ṛgvedic period. What must have happened to this mighty river? The Purāṇic version really comes to our rescue. The *Padma* and the other Purāṇas deal with the story of the River Sarasvatī: how on the ordainment of Brahmā, it carried the *Vaḍavā* even at the cost of its own extinction. What does this really indicate? In our opinion, this is a full-fledged explanation of the earthquake that must have occurred, along with the disturbance in the waters of the seas and rivers- a fact which has been recorded through the legend of 'Manu and the Fish.' The Purāṇic authors have tried to give a graphic description

5

of the state of the total destruction of the world (*praḷaya*). It must really be the above events that must have given to the people of India an idea in regard to the total destruction of humanity.

If this be so, then it should really give us courage to locate the exact date of the close of the Indus Valley civilization. Surprisingly enough, the problem of the age of the Flood is directly connected with that of the Atharvaveda, and consequently of the close of the Indus Valley civilization and the early beginnings of the Mahābhārata. In our opinion, the Flood which was really responsible for wiping off all the belongings of the whole of humanity in India at one time, must have been a reality—and the importance of which cannot be easily ignored.[1] The occurrence of the Fish-legend itself gives a clue in regard to a common age of the *Atharvaveda*, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. If we can believe in the occurrence of a flood and an earthquate immediately after the Bhārata war was over, then we can allow a period of about a century or two for the formation of the legend. Till the date of their occurrence, the Indus Valley civilization and the Ṛgvedic culture prospered. Immediately after the occurrence the story of the Fish as the saviour of mankind came into vogue. With the close of the Indus Valley civilization we find almost a blank in the history of India. And it gave a new impetus to the Aryans to spread their own culture in the various parts of India.

Other Problems

After solving the problem of the pre-Ṛgvedic priority and the post-Ṛgvedic survival of the Indus Valley people we shall now try to have a peep into their religious activities in India. After doing that, we shall deal with the other problems in connection with the early home of the Vrātyas, their migration towards the other countries and their contact with the Aryans in general. We have reserved these for the final chapter of this Volume.

1. A.P. Karmarkar, 'The Fish in Indian Folk-lore and the Age of the Atharvaveda', *A.B.O.R.I.*, XXIV, p. 203.

PART II
THE VRATYA PANTHEON

CHAPTER III
THE DIVINE TRIAD

Introductory — Proto-Indian Period — Vedic tradition — Later Period.

When carefully analysed the 'Vrātya Pantheon' becomes an all-inclusive term or expression. Especially, 'since the proto-Indian times the number of gods of the Vrātya pantheon goes on increasing, so much so, that, later on one begins to suspect whether the whole of Aryanism is nothing but a part and parcel of the Vrātya religion itself.

During the Mohenjo Daro period, the chief gods of the proto-Indians were Śiva, Mūrugaṇ and Ammā, being the proto-types of the historic Śiva, Subrahmaṇya or Kārttikēya and Pārvatī, and the Linga, the ring-stones and the Sun respectively. Besides, there were the other deities and cults in vogue e.g. the Moon, Ayanars, the God of the fields, the God of the Nāga (Cobra), the Fish, Nīlavan, God of rains, thunder, the nether-world, and some other local and personal gods. Besides, tree worship (especially of Pippal) was in vogue. The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions throw light on the early beginnings of the belief in ghosts, *etc*.

We have adopted the readings of Rev. Heras wherever possible. As we have observed in the previous chapter, the Vedic literature is capable of supplying us a better Dravidian vocabulary. In the light of the same we have effected a few changes e. g. Śiva instead of Āṇ-though the latter word also seems to have been current. The Sumerian inscriptions have revealed the wonderful truthfulness of the above readings. In fact the three gods of early Sumer were An, Enlil and Ama, which evidently seem to have been more properly derived from the Dravidian expressions: Āṇ, Āṇil and Ammā. The representations of the Soma-Skanda images during the Pallava period clearly exhibit the existence of the main tradition of the country handed down since the proto-Indian period.

Probably, immediately after the Neolithic Period was over, a special sanctity seems to have been given to various animals e.g. the Bull, the Cow, the Fish, the Serpent (Nāga), the Monkey, and later on, the Lion, the Tiger, the Peacock and other animals. Thus the Mohenjo Daro period seems to have been one of transition from the early tolemistic to the later civilized stages. On the advent of the Vedic Aryans, the element of Rudra is introduced in the Vedic pantheon. The three-faced figure of Śiva acted as a source of inspiration to the Brahmins for introducing the two Gods Brahmā and Viṣṇu also therein. Thus the notion of the Trimūrti or Trinity was ushered in during the Epic and the Purāṇic period. The Vrātyas have their own lore of ghosts, spirits and goblins.

With this brief survey of the gods of the Dravidian pantheon we shall now deal with their 'life-sketches' in detail in the following pages.

Divine Triad : Proto-Indian Period

The early Vrātyas worshipped the Divine Triad. The names of the deities representing this Triad are Śiva, Mūrugaṇ and Ammā. These are evidently the proto-types of the historic Śiva, Subrahmaṇya or Kārttikēya, and Pārvatī respectively. The inscriptions are generally silent in regard to the details of their mutual relationship. However, one of the inscriptions describes : 'The joined life of the united three Great Gods.' [1]

A similar Triad of Gods is found in Sumerian inscriptions. Father Heras observes: 'The three gods of Sumer in pre-historic times were An, Ama and Enlil. An was the father, Ama was the mother, and Enlil was the son, who afterwards in historic Sumerian times became the father. I suspect that the proto-Dravidian Triad must be similar to this. In fact, An the father of Sumer, is the same Āṇ, the Supreme Being of India. The mother is called Ama in Sumer. Now Ammā is the common word for mother in Dravidian languages and a good number of clay statuettes of the mother-goddess have been found in Mohenjo Daro and Harappa.'[2]

It is also interesting to note that some of the representations of these three Gods were recently discovered in Sumer. 'The images of these Gods are made of copper, with inlaid eyes and represent two men and one woman, all naked. The two men have locks of hair, but longer as they cover the nipples of the chest. Both wear a girdle round their waist. One of these figures representing men is several inches higher than the other two. The highest image seems to be a representation of Śiva, the shorter figure of a man seems to be an icon of Mūrugaṇ, the figure of a woman represents Ammā.'[3]

Ammā was also styled as Mīnkaṇṇi[4] (the same as the later Mīnākṣi, *e.g.* at Madura). Again, the proto-Indian name of Subrahmaṇya was Mūrugaṇ.[5] His two other names of endearment were Velan (meaning the one of trident) and Āṇil (son of Āṇ). His exact relation with Śiva was that of a son and father.[6] He was a God of the Velāḷas and other tribes.

Vedic Tradition

The Vedic Aryans did not accept this notion of the Divine Triad. On the contrary they seem to have treated it with a spirit of abhorrence. We have already observed in the second Chapter-that one of the Ṛgvedic hymns[7] refers to three persons—a male (Pumān), a female (Strī) and the Mūradevas-an idea which is akin to the three (male, female and son) of the Mohenjo Daro period. Moreover, the expression Mūradeva, the god of the non-Aryans, seems to be a Sanskritized form of the word Mūrugaṇ or Mūruga, which is

1. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 209.
2. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to inscriptions.' *Journal of the University of Bombay*, V. 1, July, 1936 ; Cf. also, Radau, *Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to God Nim*, pp. 4–7.
3. Cf. Radau, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–19 ; Heras, '*Plastic Representation of God amongst the Proto-Indians*,' *Sardesai Com. Volume*, pp. 228–29.
4. Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 338.
5. *Photo. M. D.*, 1928–29, No. 5890.
6. Cf. under *Mūrugaṇ* or *Kārttikēya*.
7. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 104. 24.

also an early Tamil name for Kārttikeya or Subrahmaṇya. The most interesting factor in the above stanza is that the female is described as being perfect in arts of magic or māyā, an expression which becomes equivalent to the Illusory Power of God (Māyā-Śakti) during the later period.

Absence of Gaṇapati.

It is worth noting that the acceptance of the idea of the Triad brings us to another conclusion, namely, that there must have been a total absence of Gaṇapati in the earlier stages of the Hindu pantheon. Gaṇapati, as we shall see later on, is simply an outcome of the exuberance and fanciful imagination of the later writers. At least we do not hear about him as having been the son of Śiva and Pārvatī till the end of the period of the *Harivaṁśa*. But Skanda was known as the son of Śiva since very early times. The Gṛhyasūtras recommend that in the spit-ox ceremony the offering be made to a cow and a calf in place of Rudra, his consort and Jayanta.[1] This is exactly the Triad of Mohenjo Daro. Further Patañjalī refers to the images of only Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha,[2] and to none of Gaṇapati—a fact which clearly proves the early absence of Gaṇapati in the Vrātya pantheon.

Tradition in Pallava Architecture.

That the Triad originally consisted of the proto-types of Śiva, Kārttikēya and Pārvati, becomes clear from the various representations of Soma-Skanda existing in Southern India. Dubreuil rightly observes in this connection: 'In our days Śiva with Pārvatī (Umā) and small child Subrahmaṇya (Skanda) are still represented. Soma-skanda is never seen anywhere in the caves of Ellora and Bādāmī, but, on the other hand, this image is the great master-design of Pallava inconography. It is so often represented in the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāñcīpuram, that it is useless to count upon.'[3] Again he makes a further remark that, 'it represented the essential part of Pallava Śaivism about 700 A.D., for the image is usually found in front of the *liṅgam* on the wall which forms the back of the sanctuary (cf. Pl. 1). Śiva and Pārvatī, who carries Subrahmaṇya on her knees, are seated on a bench. The attitude of the divine family are full of calmness and nobility. Śiva's left arm is in the same position as that of Buddha begging. The other arms carry no emblems except snakes. Viṣṇu and Brahmā stand, one on the right, the other on the left, a little behind Śiva.'[4]

The notion of the Divine Triad also travelled in different countries of the world. The Triad among the Hittites consisted of the Sun-God, the Sun-Goddess of Arinna, and Telepinu. An, Enlil and Ama were the three Great Gods in Sumer. The Phœnicians had El, Aleyaṇ and Astarte as their Divine Triad.[5] With the prevalence of the notion of the three Gods, a special significance came to be attached to number three also during the historical period.

1. Cf. under Śiva (*Sūlagava Sacrifice*).
2. Patañjali on *Pāṇini*, V, 3, 99.
3. Jouveau Dubreuil, *Iconography of Southern India* (Trans. by A.C. Martin), p. 34.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Heras, MS.

CHAPTER IV

SIVA-RUDRA

I

Introductory

It has been observed how the worship of the Divine Triad was in vogue amongst the proto-Indians. Śiva was evidently the proto-type of the historic Śiva-Rudra. It is really a most wonderful phenomenon that Śiva retains the same unique popularity in the Hindu pantheon of today, as he did during the proto-Indian period. The history of Śiva has undergone many vicissitudes during this long period. First, being the Supreme God of the proto-Indians he was naturally worshipped by them. Moreover, the various inscriptions and the representations of Śiva throw a considerable light on his different aspects. He was held by the proto-Indians both as a philosophical entity, and as a God to be meditated upon. Besides, Śiva is described as one having many attributes and emblems. However, with the advent of the Vedic period, we find that the Vedic bards tried to present a new personality before us by introducing the character of Rudra. The next effort of the Aryans mainly lay towards causing an amalgamation of these two Gods, e.g. Śiva and Rudra respectively. During the post-Vedic period he is given a subordinate position altogether by being made to occupy a third place in the Hindu Trinity. Best of all, a new myth is added for every act or attribute of Śiva. In fact Śiva becomes a unique personality with many miracles and myths. He comes into possession of newer struggles in the course of his contact with the newer gods that are introduced in the Hindu pantheon.

II

Śiva in the Indus Valley period

Siva-the Supreme Being—As Trimūrti—His eight forms—His Fish form—His names—His three eyes—As Ardhanārīśvara—Emblems of Siva—As a Himālayan God—Siva and Linga—Some representations—As Paśupati—As a Yogin—His throne—His head-gear—His mane—As a nude god — His four arms—As a dancer—As a Fertility God.

The Indus Valley period endows Śiva with a full-fledged mythology. It is really a surprising phenomenon in the literary history of India that very little has been said in the early Aryan documents about this most ancient god of the Vrātyas. Various scholars have tried to trace the development of Śiva and the other deities of the Vrātya pantheon by adducing evidence from early Indian literature. But no convincing explanation is given to show how so many myths regarding Śiva as a dancer, a Trimūrti, a Yogin, a Himālayan God, a God with three eyes, a Paśupati, a Fertility God, and others came into vogue abruptly in the Purāṇic period alone. However, the Indus Valley finds have created a new avenue of thought in the field of scholarship, and they fill in a great gap in the history of Indian religion.

The Supreme Being

The inscriptions relate that the Supreme Being exists by itself.[1] The name of the Supreme Being is Śiva.[2] He is the Supreme Being of all the gods of the Temple. He is the lord of the whole universe. The fact that the other name of Śiva was Āṇ becomes clear from the corroborative evidence obtaining in the Purāṇas and the Epics. The *Mahābhārata* refers to Āṇ, meaning Śiva.[3] Further the word Aṇu, which is a later rendering of the word Āṇ is frequently used as a name of Śiva. The word Sthāṇu, according to the *Brahmāṇḍa* and other Purāṇas, meant a standing figure of Śiva.[4] Further the *Harivaṁśa* narrates that Aṇuha practised the Aṇu-dharma, which expression evidently meant the religion of Āṇ or Śiva, or the 'Śaivism' of the later period. The word Āṇ-Śiva travelled to Sumer, Egypt and other countries. Father Heras observes that the word Anu in 'the feast of the striking of Anu' in Egypt is actually connected with the followers of Anu or Āṇ.[5]

His Attributes

Father Heras observes that the inscriptions relate that, 'the Supreme Being is self-subsistent, and therefore, is the source of life and activity, which is indicated by the term 'Val' in an inscription which reads, 'The Supreme Being of Life.'[6] He is the only one e.g. Mīna, the *Farmer of the Crab*, about whom the One has decreed.[7] He is Great,[8] Omniscient (Viḍukaṉ),[9] Benevolent,[10] and possesses the power of Destruction and Generation[11].

Early Idea of Trimurti

Some of the seals represent the three-faced figure of Śiva. The number three attained a divine significance on account of the fact that the Mohenjo Darians believed in the existence of the Divine Triad formed of Śiva, Kārttikeya and Ammā respectively. Thus this must have led the artists to represent the three-fold cosmogonic functions also in the form of a three-faced figure of Śiva. That the idea of a three-faced god belonged to the pre-Vedic period becomes evident from a reference in the *Ṛgveda* to a three-faced and six-eyed Dāsa.[12] Further, we wish to read something in the notion of Trita in the *Ṛgveda*. Is it possible that the Ṛgvedic bards introduced Trita mainly because they felt the absence of a three-faced god in their own pantheon?

Sir John Marshall has rightly pointed out that, 'of the three-faced Śiva, that is Śiva without Brahmā and Viṣṇu-there is a fine example among the ruined temples of

1. Cf. Heras, '*Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions*', *Jour. of the University of Bombay*, V. v, p. 15. Cf. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 90.
2. *Photo M.D.*, 1928–29, No. 4741.
3. Cf. *Mahābhārata Index*.
4. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Prathama Kh.*, Adh. 9, 69 ff.
5. Heras, '*Anu in Egypt and India*', Paper read before the Indian History Congress, Hyderabad, 1941.
6. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 347.
7. *Ibid*, *M.D.*, No. 180.
8. *Ibid*, *H.* No. 21.
9. *Ibid*, *H.*, No. 329.
10. *Photo*, *M. D.*, 1928–29, No. 7597.
11. Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 114.
12. *Ṛgveda*, X, 99. 6. e.g.
स इद्दासं तुवीरवं पतिर्दन् षळक्षं त्रिशीर्षाणं दमन्यत् ॥

Devāṅgaṇa near Mount Abu.'[1] Some of the Kushano-Sasanian coins also contain the representation of the three-faced figure of Śiva.[2] But regarding the meaning conveyed by the image in the Mohenjo Daro times, he observes, "Indeed, the question presents itself whether the three-faced deity on our Mohenjo Daro seal is not a syncretic form of three deities rolled into one. I do not mean by this that the philosophic idea of a triad associated with the doctrine of the absolute had taken shape at this early period, but simply that the cult of this particular god-call him Śiva or by whatever name we like-had been amalgamated with other cults, and that the fact was signified by giving him three faces instead of one. It is more likely, however, that in the first instance the god was provided with a plurality of faces in token of his all-seeing nature, that these images afterwards suggested the *trimūrti* of Śiva, Brahmā and Viṣṇu; and that the latter in their turn subsequently inspired such images as those referred to above." [3] Recently Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar also has maintained such a view. [4]

Looking to the various representations of Śiva and to what is contained in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions, we find that the Mohenjo Darians had their own deity, who formed at once the Supreme Being of the universe, and possessed the three functions of the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. The Mohenjo Daro representations indicate that the religious ideas had attained a definite stage, so that they could form a basis for future mythology. In fact the proto-Indians had already proceeded from the abstract to the concrete in so far as they had their own images of Gods (representing their various functions), temples and a cult of their own. Thus, there is every possibility of the above representation indicating the exact nature of the three cosmogonic functions of God - a fact which is conveyed by the later idea of the Hindu Trinity consisting of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. Best of all, the Kushano-Sasanian coins also contain the representations of the three-faced figure of Śiva. As we have remarked above, these representations happen to be the reminiscences of the older ones depicted on the Mohenjo Daro seals. (Cf. Part I).

His eight forms

Śiva is supposed to be the Highest God of the Heavens. He is identified with the Sun. Now the Sun in the course of the year travels through the constellations of the Zodiac, which were called by the Mohenjo Darians as houses. Accordingly, each month, the Sun being in a different house was supposed to take a different form, and since the

1. Marshall, *Mohenjo-daro and The Indus Civilization*, p. 53; D. R. Bhandarkar, *Progress Report of the A. S. W. I.*, 1906-7, p. 30. Prof. Bhandarkar specifically says that this is an image of Śiva, not of the Triad, but he does not make his reasons clear. Other examples are illustrated in T. A. Gopinatha Rao's *Elements of Hindu Iconography*: notably one at Melcheri, near Kāveri Joakkam in the N Arcot Dist., another near Gokak falls, in the Belgaum Dist., and a third at Chitargarh in Udaipur State (cf. pp. 380-6 and pls. cxvi, cxiv, I, and cxviii). Mr. Gopinatha Rao also takes the famous three-headed sculpture in the Elephanta Cave to be a representation of Maheśamūrti and not of the Trimūrti, as commonly supposed (*Ibid*, p. 382). For another example in a temple at Jagatmukh 8 miles North of Nagar in Kullu, see A. S. R., 1926-7, p. 282.
2. Cf, *Part I.*
3. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 53.
4. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 42.

constellations according to the Mohenjo Darians were only eight, the forms of the Sun, or consequently of the Supreme Being, were eight.

The eight forms of the Supreme Being were, "the Ram, the Harp, the Crab, the Mother, the Scale, the Arrow, the Jar, and the Fish or the Fishes."[1] Curiously enough the reminiscence of this idea is to be found in later literature, though in a different sense. Śiva is called Aṣṭamūrti or Aṣṭatanu (eight-bodied) in Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalam* (I, i.). But later writers not understanding the original significance of this expression have interpreted it as meaning the five elements (earth, water, fire, air and ether), the Sun, the Moon and the Ātmā.

The idea of the identification of Śiva with the Sun remained in vogue during the later period. The *Ṛgveda* calls Sūrya (Sun) as the Ātmā of the universe.[2] The *Atharvaveda* designates Rudra as thousand-eyed,[3] an expression which clearly indicates the Sun. The *Maitri Upaniṣad* maintains a tradition that the term Bharga used in the famous Gāyatrī stanza of the *Ṛgveda* denotes Rudra.[4] Though the Rudra of the *Ṛgveda* is absolutely different from Śiva of the proto-Indian period, still, the above Upaniṣadic statement must be taken to be true in so far as it connotes the vogue of an ancient tradition. The word Bharga also occurs as one of the names of Śiva in the Purāṇic literature.[5]

But much more interesting are the other statements contained in the *Padma*, *Garuḍa* and other Purāṇas. The *Padma P.* states that Umā-Mahēśvara should be worshipped with (by uttering) the names of Sūrya, and that there is no difference between Śiva and the Sun.[6] Again, the same Purāṇa describes the Sun as Rudra-vapuṣa[7] (or *Lit. Rudra*-bodied).

The *Saura Purāṇa* asserts that Rudra stands in the skies.[8] The *Garuḍa P.* describes the Śivārcana-Mantra, in which Śiva and Sūrya are brought together and invoked as one person (*e.g. Śiva-Sūryāya namaḥ*).[9] There are again references wherein Śiva is addressed only in the name of the Sun.[10] Besides, on one occasion the name of Śiva is mentioned in the list of the names of the twelve Ādityas.[11]

Fish form of Siva

The most popular of all these forms of God seems to have been the Fish. Sometimes there used to be a combination of the Supreme Being. The God of Naṇḍur was a combination of two forms of the Fish and the Ram, as both the representation and the inscription on a seal would point out.[12] The Purāṇas also wonderfully corroborate the above version

3. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
2. *Rv.*, I, 115.
3. *Av.*, XI, 2. 4.
4. *Maitri Up.*, VI, 7.
5. *Skānda P. Kāśī-khaṇḍa*, 32, 527 etc.; also, *Ibid*, *Māhēśvara—Khaṇḍa*, *Kedāra-khaṇḍa*, 27, 56.
6. *Padma P.*, 5, Adh. 24, Vs. 68-69.
7. *Ibid*, Adh. 20, 173.
8. *Saura P.*, 2,47.
9. *Garuḍa P.*, *Ācāra-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 23,6.
10. *Mbh. Śānti P.*, 290, 86; *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 68, 30, and 49, 187; *Kūrma*, *Pūrva-bhāga*, Adh. 10, p. 93; *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Madhya-bhāga*, Adh. 72, 173.
11. Cf. *Apte*, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.
12. *A.S.I. Report*, 1928, 29, Pl. XXXIII.

of the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions regarding the close association of the Fish with Śiva. (Cf. under *Zoolatry: Fish*)

His Names

According to Father Heras Śiva was designated by the following names:[1] *Iruvan* (one who exists), *Eṇmai* (eight-formed), *Viḍukan* (all-seeing), *Péran*[2] and *Tāṇḍavan*.[3]

His three eyes

According to Father Heras, 'the idea was so well-known that the only mention of his "three eyes"[4], as we find in the inscriptions, revealed to those people the idea of the Supreme Being'.[5] The three eyes of God were worshipped.[6] God was eventually three-eyed. One of the inscriptions records: 'the three-eyed of the Mīnas who are Mūn Paravas.'[7] In one of the inscriptions the connection between the three-eyed God and the Fish is established.[8] The three eyes of the Great Fish are once referred to.[9] Again, the expression Spring-fish[10] has been used to denote the symbol of fertility of God, who is specially seen in the Spring. Two inscriptions make a mention of one eye only,[11] which refers to the third eye, 'that grew at a later period'.

Soon after, we find that the Supreme Being is called Fish-eyed.[12] In one place it is said, 'three Fish-eyes,'[13] thus directly referring to the Supreme Being.

Siva as Ardhanarisvara

The idea of Ardhanārīśvara was current among the proto-Indians. One of the inscriptions relates, 'One Ammān of the chariot of the Sun.'[14] Father Heras observes that, 'this is the same as the deity found in Sumer, with the name of Amā - ā - half-man (proper left) and half-woman (proper right), which seems to be the original idea of the Hindu image of Ardhanārīśvara.'[15] In another inscription Ammān is connected 'with the tree e.g. this is the tree of the renowned Mīnapati who is in Ammān.'[16]

His emblems

The three emblems of Śiva are described as being the *serpent*, the *axe* and the *trident*.

1. Cf. Heras, '*The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions*,' *J U.B.*, V. I., pp. 1-29.
2. *Photo M.D.*, 1928-29, No, 6379.
3. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 449.
4. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 379.
5. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
6. Marshall, *M. D*, No. 8.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 111.
9. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 68.
10. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 111; Photo M. D., 1929-30, No. 8222; Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 405; *Ibid H.*, No. 89,
11. Marshall, *H.*, No. 3278.
12. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 261; *Ibid.* M. D., No. 254, etc.
13. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 365.
14. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 209.
15. Heras, 'Religion of the Mohenjo Daro people, etc.,' *J.U.B.*, V, 1, p. 18.
16. Mackay, *M.D.*, 451 of 1930-31.

Siva as a Himalayan God

The notion of Śiva as a Himālayan God seems to have been in vogue during the proto-Indian period. One of the inscriptions states, 'those are the middle mountains of the holy Fish of the Velāḷas.'[2] Another inscription makes a more definite statement e.g. 'the Moon (is) over the white mountain of he of Velan of the Linga of the divided house of the two high suns.'[3]

Siva and Linga

The Linga was already identified with Śiva during this period. (Cf. under *The Linga*).

Some Representations of Śiva

The archæological evidence obtaining in the proto-Indian sites throws light on the different aspects of Śiva. In fact the later notion of Śiva as a Paśupati, a Trimūrti (or Trinity), a prince of Yogins, a Dancer, and other ideas-all find their origin here in these early finds.

As Pasupati

Some of the seals represent Śiva as seated on a low throne surrounded by animals, a buffalo, a rhinoceros, an elephant, a tiger and an ibex.[4] This image is described by Sir John Marshall as the Paśupati of Mohenjo Daro.[5] But as Father Heras has observed, "this image or a similar one may certainly have originated the idea of Paśupati at a later period, but it cannot be called the Paśupati. It is the representation of Śiva surrounded by five, perhaps six (for a corner of the seal is broken) Lāñcchanas of the proto-Indian tribes".[6] To us this interpretation seems to be correct. We know for certain that in the early period, the various proto-Indian tribes had their own *Lāñcchanas* consisting of the figures of animals. And every tribe would be recognized by its particular *Lāñcchana*. Eventually the God of these tribes was naturally the Over lord of the various animals, which happened to be their Lāñcchanas.

But in the post-Ṛgvedic period the notion of Paśupati, literally the lord of beasts, changes its original meaning. The early Rudra, who was altogether different from *Śiva*, was identified with God Agni, who was also designated as the lord of beasts because the beasts were offered through him. The idea was also current that Rudra was beseechd for p rotecting the cattle. Naturally the old idea of the Mohenjo Daro period lost its real connotation, and the latter idea came into vogue with a different meaning altogether *e.g.* the whole of humanity called as beasts of the Supreme Being who himself was designated as Paśupati. It is also possible that the close association

1. Heras, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
2. Marshall, *op. cit.*, III, M. D., No. 130.
3. Heras, 'Velāḷas in Mohenjo Daro,' *I.H.Q.*, Vol. XIV, 1938, pp. 46-47.
4. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization*, I, Pl. XII-17. etc.
5. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and The Indus Civilization*, I, p. 54; Mookerji, *Hindu Civilization*, p. 52 (Paris, 1935); Mackay, *The Indus Civilization*, p. 70.
6. Heras, '*Plastic Representation of God Amongst the Proto-Indians*,' *Sar. Com.* Vol., p. 224. Note also that the word totems is replaced by the one 'lāñcchanas', which according to Father Heras gives a correct rendering.

of Śiva with the Nandī must have given rise to the three expressions, *Pati, Paśu* and *Pāśa*, which attain a great philosophical significance later on.

As a Yogin

The above image reveals another aspect of *Śiva*. In the Purāṇic period Śiva is generally designated as *Mahātapaḥ*, *Yogīśvara*, etc. And the image represented here shows the early traits of the deity. In fact, "the image of *Śiva* is represented in the male form, completely nude with a prominent *Ūrdhva linga*. His legs are not crossed as usual in images of Buddha, Mahāvīra and other ascetics, but in such a way as to have the soles of the feet touching each other. Round his waist there is a zone or ribbon. Hanging from the neck he wears a huge necklace that takes a triangular shape with the point below. Eleven armlets are around his arms. Three of them in the wrist, in the elbow and near the shoulder are larger than the rest. His hands rest upon the knees. His face looks emaciated, as befits a *Yogī*, and apparently he is three-faced. The front nose specially is most prominent."

The tradition is retained in literature. In the *Atharvaveda*, Ēkavratya, the proto-type of later Rudra-Śiva, is said to know the process of Yoga.[1] Later in the Epics and the Purāṇas Śiva is styled as *Ūrdhva-linga*, *Urdhva-retas*, which expressions indicate the ascetic practices of Yoga, because both of them mean lit. 'drawing the semen above' by means of *Yogic* powers. Śiva is styled as a Yogin *par excellence*.

Throne of Siva

In the above representations there are the images of the deer or ibex beneath the throne. As Marshall has observed, "two deer in a like position are portrayed on many medieval images of Śiva, especially when he appears in the form of Dakṣiṇā-Mūrti or Yoga-Dakṣiṇāmūrti, and a deer (mṛga) held in one of his hands is a frequent attribute of the god in other manifestations. The Buddhists seem to have adopted it while depicting the Buddha's throne in the *Dharma-cakra* scene, where they are symbolic of the deer-park, in which the first sermon was preached.[2]"

Head-gear

Sir John Marshall describes the head-dress of Śiva represented on one of the seals as a 'pair of horns meeting in a tall head-dress.'[3] Mackay, while describing another representation, remarks that, 'the head-dress is a twig with leaves like those of the Pippal.'[4] In regard to a third representation, he describes the head-gear as 'of two horn-like objects between which there appears to be a spike of flowers.'[5] Father Heras has observed that these are the representations of the trident placed over the head of Śiva However, in our opinion, the horns must have first of all connoted horns of the bull, which was closely associated with the cult of Śiva. But later on this must have

1. Marshall, *op. cit.* I, p. 55. For the deer beneath the throne, cf. Gopinatha Rao, *The Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. II, pt. i, pp. 279-89, and Pls. lxxi and lxxvii ; for the deer held in the hand, pp. 184, 136, 163, 134, 168, 174, 200, etc.
2. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 55.
3. *Ibid*, p. 52. According to him this was the precursor of the later trident.
4. Mackay, *Further Excavations*, p. 335.
5. *Ibid*.

transformed itself in the trident, which becomes the emblem of Śiva during the historical period. This can be seen from the representation of Śiva on the Kushano-Sasanian coins. Therein the horns with the head-dress transform themselves into flowers also. This throws a wonderful light on the meaning of a story related in a Tamil poem Paṭṭu-paṭṭu. "It is stated that a chief named *Nallia Koḍan* being afraid of his enemies prayed to Mūrugaṇ (Subrahmaṇya) for help. The God appeared to him in his dream and ordered him to pluck a flower from the well and throw it at his enemies. When he went to the well in the morning instead of a flower he found the very trident of Mūrugaṇ, and throwing it at his enemies he destroyed them. In memory of this victory, Nallia Koḍan founded the city of Vellūr (Vellore) in the place where he had found Mūrugaṇ's trident".[1] In corroboration of this an inscription at Mohenjo Daro reads, "That is the village trident that has the Nandukal flowers of Velūr".[2]

The copper images of An found at Khafage clearly brings to our notice the horn and the trident-character of the so-called head-gear of Śiva.[3] The same notion has travelled abroad e.g. the horn-crown in a carving of the Kurangun rocks in ancient Elam;[4] the horn-crown of the Akkadian king Naram-Sin in his famous 'stele of victory' kept in the Louvre Museum; the crown represented in the statuette of the Phœnician God Baal (discovered at Ras Shamra);[5] and finally, the three pairs of horns round the crowns of the Assyrian kings and of the winged bulls that keep watch over the palace doors.

The tradition remains in vogue during the later period. In the *Ṛgveda* the tribe of Viṣāṇins,[7] who took part in the battle of the Ten Kings, seem to be so called because they used to wear helmets with horns of the Mohenjo Daro type. The tradition is still retained in South India in the figure of Ayanār, who is shown to have been bearing on the head a pair horns with a bunch of flowers issuing from the middle.[8] Further a similar covering over the head is found in the case of the figure of the Goddess Muttyālammā at Āvani.[9] Best of all the *Śaṅkara-digvijaya* states that the Jaṅgamas used to bear the trident on their head.[10] If this be so, it should be no matter of surprise if the Aryans also imitated this style and referred to the horns of Agni or Brahmaṇaspati.

Mane of Siva

On one of the seals there is an interesting representation of Śiva.[11] Mr. Mackay observes that, "a pig-tail hangs down on one side of the head which has one face only, in profile, facing of the right."[12] Father Heras has rightly interpreted it as conveying 'a long mane that falls from the back of his head.[13]

1. Heras, '*Further Excavation at Mohenjo Daro*,' *New Review*, *January*, 1939, p. 66 ff.
2. *Ibid*, p. 67.
3. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
4. Hertsfeld, *Archæological History of Iran*, pl. III.
5. Dussand, *Les De' converies de Ras Shamra* et *l' ancient Testament* (Paris, 1937), p. 42.
6. Cf. Heras, *op. cit.*, 67.
7. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 18. 7.
8. Jouveau Dubreuil, *Iconography* of *Southern India* (trans. by A. C. Martin), Fig. 36, p. 113.
9. Krishna Sastri, *South Indian Images*, p. 225.
10. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 86.
11. Photo, M.D. 1930-31, No. 7997.
12. Mackay, *Further Excavations*, p. 335.
13. Heras, '*The Plastic Representation of God Amongst the Proto-Indians*', *Sardesai Com. Volume*, p. 227.

Siva as a nude God

Śiva is always represented in a nude posture. In the later Sumerian period, he is shown in the same fashion—a fact which is borne by the copper images found at Khafage (Sumer). That there was such an ancient tradition of depicting Śiva as nude, can also be seen from the interpretation of the word Sthāṇu (a standing nude Rudra) given in the *Brahmāṇḍa* and other Purāṇas. The expression *Śiśnadeva* in the *Rgveda* denotes such a tradition (cf. *infra*).

Siva with Four Arms

When Śiva is represented with four arms, the pictograph means *Kaḍavul*, 'a man with four arms.'[1]

Siva–the Dancer

One of the statues of Śiva found in the Mohenjo Daro sites is described by Sir John Marshall as the proto-type of a youthful dancing Śiva.[2] The twisted representation of the torso and the lifted position of the left leg, and also the fact that arrangements were made to make the head and hands movable-all these point to the above conclusion. This seems to have been the original representation of Naṭarāja. Just to corroborate this there is also an inscription which says, "The four trees in which Tāṇḍavan is."[3] The four trees does indicate a 'Forest'. The *Skānda Purāṇa*[4] also refers to the dancing image of Śiva situated in the Nyagrodha forest. Can this be the sam forest as that of the *Bhāruṇḍa-vana* of the Matsyas situated to the north of the River Sarasvatī ?

As a Fertility God

Both the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and representations of Śiva evince the fact that he was considered as a Fertility God during the proto-Indian period. One of the inscriptions describes Śiva as 'the Lord (Perāl) of the charict and the cultivated field.[5] Now, there is an interesting representation of the fertility God, which Sir John Marshall describes as: "The cult of the Earth or Mother Goddess is evidenced by a remarkable oblong sealing from Harappa, on which a nude female figure is depicted upside down with legs apart and with a plant issuing from her womb. This figure is at the right extremity of the obverse face. At the left end of the same face and separated from it by an inscription of six letters are a pair of animal "genii"...."[6] But Father Heras has rightly observed that, 'if one examines this object carefully, one identifies this object with a four-legged bug, a sort of cockroach, which is attached to the membrum. This insect is also represented on some other seals.[7] He further concludes from this and other similar representations found at Uruk, Ur and Egypt, that,' it was this beetle which finally became a symbol of fertility and even of rebirth, that being the reason why images of the beetle were put over the mummies. The origin of the idea of the Fertility God Bes can also be traced here.'[8]

1. Heras, *op. cit* etc. p. 232.
2. *Ibid*, p. 233 ; also, fig. No. 12 in the same article.
3. Marshall, *op. cit.*, No. 449.
4. *Skānda P. Māheśvarakh. Aruṇācala Mā.*, 2,2,66,
5. Marshall, *M.D.*, 37.
6. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, Pl, XV, Nos. 12, 14, 18, 19 and 22,
7. Heras, in *Ācarya—Puṣpāñjali Volume*, p. 121.
8. *Ibid*. pp. 121 ff.

Thus after having detailed the various aspects of Śiva, we shall now see how he undergoes various changes at the hands of the Ṛgvedic bards later on.

III

The Vedic Period

Introductory—The Ṛgvedic Rudra—Origin of Rudra—Post-Ṛgvedic and Brāhmaṇic Period—Rudra in Ritual—The Śūlagava sacrifice.

Introductory. In the pre-Vedic period Śiva formed a unique monotheistic deity of the Vrātyas. The inscriptions describe him as being the sole creator, preserver and ruler of the universe. The various representations of Śiva show that they must have acted as the precursors of the later mythology. To state it briefly : Śiva is identified with the Sun. His forms are eight *e.g.* the eight constellations of the Zodiac. He has three eyes. He is a Yogin *par excellence.* His main symbols are the trident, the serpent and the axe respectively. He has a deer-throne to sit upon, and a long mane. He is represented as a dancer (taṇṭu-tāṇḍavan). He is designated as *ammān* or *ardha-nārīśvara*. Finally he is called the lord of the mountains. All these details point out that there is something common between this proto-Indian lore and the descriptions given about Śiva in the Epics and the Purāṇas.

On the contrary, the Vedic period presents before us a very different phase altogether. The *Ṛgveda* depicts the various characteristics of Rudra, they are all different from those of Śiva. The post-Ṛgvedic works are mainly busy in bringing about a fusion of the main characteristics of the two deities. We shall, however, study the main features of the Vedic period presently.

The Ṛgvedic Rudra

Personal Characteristics The Ṛgvedic bards have given a graphic description of this deity. Like Pūṣan he has the braided hair (*Kapardin*).[1] He is brown-coloured (*babhru*).[2] He has two arms,[3] and possesses firm limbs.[4] He wears golden ornaments,[5] and has a glorious multiform necklace (*Niṣka*).[6] He sits on a car-seat.[7] Rudra is described as possessing beautiful lips.[8] His shape is dazzling.[9] He is multiform. He shines like the brilliant sun.[10] He is the best among gods and self-glorious.[11] He is designated as Triyambaka.[12]

As a Hero The *Ṛgveda* depicts Rudra as being armed with a bow and arrows.[13] The arrows are strong and swift.[14] He is invoked with Kṛśānu and the archers. He is unsurpassed in strength, and is the

1. *Ṛgveda*, I, 114. 1; cf. also Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology*.
2. *Ibid*, II, 33. 5 etc.
3. *Ibid*, II. 33, 3.
4. *Ibid*, II, 33. 11.
5. *Ibid*, II, 33. 9.
6. *Ibid*, II, 33, 10.
7. *Ibid*, II, 33. 4.
8. *Ibid*, II, 33, 5.
9. *Ibid*, I, 114, 5.
10. *Ibid*, I, 43. 5.
11. *Ibid*, I, 129. 3. etc.
12. *Ibid*. Cf. *under Triyambaka-homa below*.
13. *Ibid*, II, 33. 10-11; V, 42. 11; X, 125. 6.
14. *Ibid*, VII, 46. 1.

strongest.[1] He holds the thunder-bolt in his arms.[2] He is an Asura of heaven.[3] He is described as a bull,[4] and as unaging, glorious,[5] and a ruler of heroes.[6]

As Lord of the Universe

The Ṛgvedic bard gives us some idea regarding the all-supremacy of Rudra. He says: "He through his lordship thinks on beings of the earth, on heavenly beings through his high imperial sway."[7] Further, Rudra is described as the ordainer and Lord[8] (Īśāna) of the universe.

As a Malevolent Deity

In many of the Ṛgvedic stanzas Rudra is described as a fierce, malevolent, and as a deity always causing havoc among children, men, cattle and the horses. He is said to have been discharging brilliant shafts which he possesses. The poet prays: "May thy bright arrow which, shot down by thee from heaven, flieth from the earth, pass us uninjured."[9] Further, he possesses weapons which slay cows and men.[10] The following passage expresses well the idea: 'Far be thy dart that killeth men or cattle.'[11] In another passage the poet describes him as 'man-slaying' (nṛghna).'[12] Further, the poet describes him as the bringer of diseases e. g. "Drive away from us enmity and distress and diseases to a distance."[13] Or again, there could be no stronger expression than the following: 'Celebrate the renowed and youthful god, mounted on his chariot, terrible as a beast, destructive and fierce."[14]

As a Beneficent Deity

Apart from his characteristics as a malevolent deity the excellent and beneficent qualities of Rudra are also depicted in the *Ṛgveda*. He is always described as wise, intelligent,[15] beneficent and bountiful[16] (*mīḍhvas*). Again, the designation *Jalāṣa-bheṣaja*[17] is applied to him. He is described as possessing healing remedies. The poet says: 'To Rudra, Lord of the sacrifice, of hymns and balmy medicines, we pray for joy and health and strength.[18]

Rudra is the best physician of the physicians. The poet prays: "Let us not anger thee with worship, Rudra, ill-praise, strong god: or mingled invocation. Do thou with strengthening balms incite our heroes, I hear thee famed as the best of all physicians."[19]

Rudra is said to possess a thousand medicines: 'Thou, very gracious God, hast thousand medicines; inflict no evil on our sons or progeny."[20] Or again, here prays the devotee for those pure and salutory remedies belonging to the Maruts and Rudra, which Father Manu desired: "Of your pure medicines, Potent Maruts

1. *Ibid*, II, 33. 3.
2. *Ibid*, II, 33. 3.
3. *Ibid*. II, 16.
4. *Ibid*, II, 33, 7: VII, 8, 15.
5. *Ibid*. I. 129. 3; X, 12. 9.
6. *Ibid*, I, 114. 1-2 etc.
7. *Ibid*, VII, 46. 2.
8. *Ibid*, II, 33. 9.
9. *Ibid*, VII, 463.
10. *Ibid*, I. 114. 10.
11. *Ibid*, IV, 3. 6.
12. *Ibid*, IV, 3. 6.
13. *Ibid*, II, 33. 2.
14. *Ibid*, II, 133. 1.
15. *Ibid*, II, 33. 7 etc.
16. *Ibid*, I, 114. 3,
17. *Ibid*. Macdonell interprets it as 'possessing healing remedies'; cf. *Vedic Mythology*, p 76.
18. *Ibid*. I, 43.4.
19. *Ibid*, II, 33. 4,
20. *Ibid*, VII, 46.3.

those that are wholesomest and health-bestowing, more which our Father Manu hath bestowed, I crave from Rudra for our gain and welfare."[1] In one of the passages Rudra is described as the protector of the cattle (Paśupā).[2]

Maruts : Sons of Rudra

Rudra is described as the father of the Maruts.[3] 'They are more frequently spoken of as his sons and are serveral times called Rudras or Rudrīyas.' Rudra created them from the shining udder of Pṛśni.[4] They are otherwise always associated with Indra. We need not enter into the other details of these gods.

Nature and Origin of Rudra

The main characteristics of the Vedic Rudra may be summarized as follows: 'Rudra is distinctly formidable: he wields the lightning and the thunderbolt and is an archer. He is as destructive as a terrible beast. He is unassailable, rapid, young, and unaging. He is the ruler of the world, and its father. He is also described as wise, beneficent, beautiful, easily invoked and auspicious (Śiva). He is a healing God. Further, the Vedic bards always deprecate his wrath and pray that his shaft may not fall upon them, their parents, children, men, cattle or the horses. He is also called man-slaying.'[5]

It is thus evident that the Ṛgvedic Rudra is absolutely a different personality–different from Śiva of the proto-Indian period. It should be noted, however, that the 'euphemistic epithet' Śiva (derived from the Dravidian *Śivan*-red), which becomes the most significant and popular name of Śiva during the later period, is applied to Rudra. This may actually indicate the early effort made by the Aryans to cause an amalgamation between Rudra and Śiva of the Indus Valley period. The existence of the non-Aryan tribe of Śivas (probably derived from Śiva) confirms our point of view. Macdonell points out that the word is used only in the sense of 'auspicious.'[6] However, we are not now in a position to agree with him mainly on account of the discovery of the finds in the Indus Valley region.

Origin of Rudra

The problem of the origin of Rudra has attained a peculiar significance in the field of research. However, it has been made rather difficult of solution, which can be perceived from the fact that the two issues, namely, those of Rudra and Śiva, are mixed up together while deciding the origin of the former.

The Indian tradition derives the word Rudra from the root 'Rud' to cry. Pischel[7] interprets it as meaning 'ruddy'. Grassmann opines that it means 'to shine'. Various theories have been propounded by different scholars regarding the origin of the deity. Weber expressed his opinion that, 'the deity was originally the howling of the storm, the plural therefore denoting the Maruts; but the deity as known to the *Yajurveda*, is essentially a compound of the two gods of fire and storm, both being

1. *Ṛgveda*, II, 33. 13.
2. *Ibid*, I, 114. 9.
3. *Ibid*, I, 114. 6, etc.
4. *Ibid*, II, 34. 2.
5. Cf. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, I, p. 145.
6. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 77; cf. *Ṛgveda*, 10, 92. 9.
7. Pischel, *Z.D.M.G.*, XL, 120.

alike in their sound.'[1] Hillebrandt proposed that, 'Rudra is the deity of the hot season in India from the advent of summer to the autumn, and that it is possible that this idea was associated with some constellation as in the conception *Sævus Orion*.'[2] Schroeder pointed out that, 'Rudra is nothing more than the elevation to the rank of a high God of the chief of the souls of the dead'. Oldenberg admits the possibility of such a view and points out the similarity of the nature of Rudra in its essence to such figures as the mountain and wood-gods or demons, like Mars Silvanus, the Fauni, and so on, and that it is a common idea that disease comes from the mountains. He further maintains that the god is really the same throughout the whole period.[3] Arbmann proposed that the *Ṛgveda* presents a later and priestly conception of Rudra as a celestial deity, a priestly refinement from an ancient cannibalistic death-demon. He further contended that 'the nature of the post–Vedic Rudra is already indicated very clearly in the later Vedic texts, suggesting that the popular god of the Ṛgvedic period was very much the same as the post-Vedic deity, and that it is more probable that the priests of the *Ṛgveda* transmuted a popular god than god such as that of the *Ṛgveda* by any means into the later Rudra-Śiva. He has also laid stress on the term Tryambaka which is accorded to Rudra in the *Ṛgveda*, and which he interprets as referring to the god as having three mothers, a fact which connects him in his view with the cult of mothers, i.e. demonesses as patron goddesses in medieval and modern India. He adduces some other instances of Rudra as Vāstoṣpati, the association of Rudra with Munis, etc.[4] Recently Dr. Venkataramanayya has attempted to point out the similarities between Rudra and Assur, the God of Assyria. He sums up his argument by saying: 'Assur and Rudra are both solar deities; each of them is armed with a bow and arrows; and is associated with an eagle, a bull and a sacred tree. Moreover, both have a female companion who was at once a wife, as well as a mother or a sister. There is, however' a point of difference which must not be left unnoticed. Notwithstanding (as in the case of Assur) the solar affinities of Rudra, no circle or disc is mentioned in the Vedas in connection with him. Whether these similarities were accidental or due to some long forgotten contact between the two Gods can hardly be determined at present.'[5]

As we have already observed, the Vedic Rudra possesses very few characteri stics which are common to those of Śiva. The process of assimilation of the two deities Śiva and Rudra begins from the end of the Ṛgvedic period with the introduction of the double expression Rudra-Śiva. Eventually, a more successful attempt was made during the period of the *Śatarudriya*. The evidence of the *Śatarudriya* is important mainly because it points out that Rudra has two bodies, namely, the one which is fierce and the other of a benign nature, thus evidently pointing out the distinction between the fierce and demoniac Rudra, and the supreme and kindly deity Śiva of the proto-Indians.

If we keep before us the main distinction between Rudra and Śiva, we may very well realize the fallacious nature of the arguments put forth by some of the

1. Weber, *Indische Studien*, ii, 19-22.
2. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, ii. 179–208 ; (Kl. Ausg.), pp. 164–5.
3. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 215–24; *Keith*, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 146–47.
4. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, I, p. 146.
5. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra-Siva*, pp. 27–31.

scholars mentioned above. In point of fact, the views proposed by Weber, Arbmann and Venkataramanayya become rather unconvincing mainly on account of the fact, that, they have not kept the two issues of Rudra and the post-Ṛgvedic Rudra-Śiva apart from each other. Oldenberg's theory becomes unconvincing mainly because he insists upon the fact that Rudra remains the same during the whole of the Vedic and post–Vedic period. But, as we shall find it later on, a clear effort was being made by the Aryans to Aryanize Śiva and merge him in their deity Rudra. Arbmann's view is rather too far–fetched mainly because there was really no ancient cannibalistic death-demon from which the Ṛgvedic people produced this celestial deity. The conception of the proto–Indians regarding Śiva was of a very noble character. Hence there was nothing in Śiva which could have been refined by the priestly classes. In the light of this observation, his other arguments naturally lose their force. Further Venkataramanayya has not rightly appreciated the difference between the Ṛgvedic Rudra, and Rudra as depicted in the later literature. After a thorough investigation one easily perceives that God Assur possesses characteristics which belonged to Śiva originally. Assur's close association with the female goddess, the tree or the disc of the Sun, points out his indebtedness to Śiva rather than to the Vedic Rudra.

Other matters

The *Ṛgveda* also reveals some other aspects regarding the early character of Śiva. We have[1] already referred to the implied reference made to the Divine Triad. The expression Śiśnadeva actually indicates the knowledge of the Vedic Aryans regarding the nude God Śiva of the Indus Valley period (cf. under the *Linga*). The expression Tryambaka is used in connection with Rudra. We are dealing with the point in detail under *Ammā–Śakti*.[2] The Vedic Maruts lose their contact with Rudra during the later period. The Ṛgvedic gods like Ahirbudhnya, Apām Napāt and others are associated with Rudra during the later period. We shall, however, deal with these topics later on.

Post-Ṛgvedic and Brāhmaṇic Period

We have observed how in the Ṛgvedic period itself an effort was made by the Aryans towards amalgamating the two cults of Śiva and Rudra. The expression *Rudra-Śivāḥ* used in regard to Rudra is sufficient to indicate this. The *Yajurveda*, the *Atharvaveda* and the later Brāhmaṇas have shown a clear tendency towards the assimilation of the Vratyan deity into the Aryan pantheon. It is proposed here to trace the history of Śiva and Rudra during the post-Vedic period.

The Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā

Immediately after the Ṛgvedic period we find that the first step towards a direct amalgamation of the two gods Rudra and Śiva was made in the two chapters of the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* e.g. the *Śatarudriya Hymn* and the *Tryambaka–Homa*.[3] Let us study the portion on the *Śatarudriya* presently.

1. Cf. under the *Vrātyas* in Chapter II.
2. Cf. *Tryambaka Homa under Ammā*.
3. *Taitt. Saṁ.*, IV, 5, 1 ; *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, 16 and 3.

Satarudriya Hymn

The Śatarudriya is a non-Aryan document *par excellence.* In fact, it shows a keen tendency on the part of the Aryans to Aryanize the non-Aryan deity Śiva. But, side by side with this proto-Indian God, Rudra begins to assume a significant role in the Aryan pantheon. Thus by the end of the Brāhmaṇic period we find that the two gods merge into each other completely.

It details the various characteristics of the Ṛgvedic Rudra in the following manner. Here are some of the stanzas which elucidate this:

(1) Reverence, Rudra, to thy wrath, and to thy arrow (1).

(2) The bow, (O dweller of mountain), which thou bearest in thy hands to discharge, make it, O Lord, auspicious; do not slay men and cattle (3).

(3) May the arrow of the god with braided hair (kapardin) be stringless, and his quiver contain pointless shafts (10).

(4) Reverence to thy violent weapon, unstrung, to both thy arms, and to thy bow (14).

Besides, some of the epithets applied to him in the *Ṛgveda* are so done here also e.g. 'brown' or 'tawny' (xvi.6), the god 'with spirally-braided hair' (*ibid*, 10), the 'fierce' (*ibid*, 40), 'the bountiful', the 'gracious' (51), the 'divine physician' (5), etc.

Apart from this, the author of the *Śatarudriya* has tried to add some more characteristics which are mainly of Brahmanical nature. The poet invokes:

"The deliverer, the first divine physician, hath interposed for us. Destroying all serpents, strike down and drive away all Yātudhānas (female goblins)" (5).

We know for certain that the Aryans keenly abhorred the Nāga cult. Therefore, if their Rudra were to be of Vrātya origin, they could not have invoked Rudra to kill the serpent, which happened to be an emblem of Śiva; and this characteristic is still retained in the post-Vedic period.

Again the author describes Rudra as a wearer of a sacrificial chord (17). In regard to his martial exploits Rudra is invoked as:

"Reverence to the golden-armed leader of armies, to the lord of the regions (17)."

or, "To the lord of spirits, to the conqueror, to the piercer, to the lord of armies which wound, to the towering wielder of a sword" (20).

or, "To armies, and to you leaders of armies, to you who ride in chariots, and to you without chariots, and to you the charioteers, and to you the drivers of horses, to you the great" (26).

or, "To him who has fleet armies and swift chariots, to the hero and to the splitted (34), to the helmeted, to him with cotton-quilted cuirass, with iron mail, and with armour, to him who is renowned and has a renowned army, to him who exists in drums, and in resounding blows (35), to him who is a bearer of a sword and quiver" (36).

Thus the above will show that the Ṛgvedic Rudra is an absolutely independent personality-even independent of Śiva of the proto-Indian times. But an effort was made here to amalgamate the two elements of Rudra and Śiva-without, however, introducing the name of Śiva. This has been done by introducing some more elements and attributes which more or less originally belonged to the sphere of Śiva.

Amalgamation of Rudra Siva

Rudra is described as thousand-eyed (8,13,29). The word thousand-eyed, in our opinion, connotes something of a Sun. We have already seen that Sun was identified with the Sun in the Mohenjo Daro period. Evidently, the poet must have used this attribute mainly as a reminiscence of the older but still current idea.

Here are some characteristics which are akin to those of Śiva. Rudra is described as a dweller in mountains or the lord of mountains Giriśa, Giritra, etc). This is exactly the description of Śiva. The body of Rudra is described as *Śivā-tanuḥ*. He is called as Śiva (4.1). The word Śiva, as noted elsewhere, is one of the epithets of Śiva, the word śivan meaning 'red', being of non-Aryan origin.

Further, the Rudras are invoked as: 'to you the carpenters, and to you the chariot-makers, to you the potters, and to you the blacksmiths, to you the Niṣādas, and to you the Puñjiṣṭhas, to you the leaders of dogs, to you the huntsmen (2), to you the lords of rogues (25), to the lord of plunderers, to the lord of stealers, to the observant merchant (19), etc.' All this description points out that Rudra is being identified with Śiva, who at once happened to be the lord of the common masses, and of the so-called low class people e.g. the Niṣādas and Puñjiṣṭhas, the thieves, etc. They are also directly designated as Gaṇas or tribes, or Gaṇapatis.

Moreover, Rudra is described as one 'who stretches out the world, and as one who affords deliverance (19).' All these happen to be prominently the characteristics of Śiva.

Again, here are some popular notions of a popular god depicted in the *Satarudriya*. Rudra is described as residing everywhere in the forests, in the green-haired trees, which is a direct association of Śiva with the tree (17). He is further invoked as: "Reverence to the golden-armed leader of armies, to the lord of the regions to the green-haired trees, to the lord of beasts, who is yellow like young grass, to the radiant, to the lord of roads (17), to the lord of things moving, to the lord of the fields, to the lord of forests (18), to the red architect, to the lord of trees, to the being which stretches out the worlds, to the lord of plants, to the observant merchant, to the lord of bushes (19), etc."

Rudra is said to exist everywhere. The poet invokes him as: 'to the dweller in the mountains, to him who abides in the swift, and in the flowing waters, to him who dwells in the billows and in tranquil waters, and in rivers, and on islands (31), to him who exists at the roots of trees (32), to him who lives in the magical city Sobha, in the soil, in the threshing floor, in the woods and in the bushes, in the form of sound, and in echo (34), in pathways, and roads, and rough (desert) places, and the skirts of mountains, and water-courses and lakes, and rivers, and ponds (37), in wells, in pits, and in bright clouds and in sunshine (38), guardians of the roads (60), etc.'

Thus the general trend of the *Śatarudriya* is to Aryanize a popular deity of the proto-Indians.

Śiva is always described as a mendicant and an ascetic in the Purāṇic period. He was also depicted as a Yogin *par excellence* in the proto-Indian period. Hence one would not be surprised to find the epithet 'clad in skin (Kṛttivāsas)' (51) introduced in the *Śatarudriya* also.

Various other designations are applied to Rudra e. g. Bhava, Śarva, Śipiviṣṭa, Paśupati, Nīlagrīva, Śitikaṇṭha (28), Ugra (40), Śaṅkara (4), the lord of the Bhūtas (*Bhūtānām Adhipatiḥ*) (5, 9). These happen to be the common epithets of Śiva during the later period. Especially the word Paśupati seems to have come into vogue just then. Both the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Atharvaveda* make a common use of it. It is interesting to note here that Rudra is described as a god of one of the famous tribes of the proto-Indian period. The stanza runs thus :

"May he who glides away, blue-naked and red-coloured, and whom cow-herds and female drawers of water have seen–may he, when seen, be gracious to us (7)."

Now who are these cow-herds who see this god who is gliding away? We know definitely that the expression *Gopas* is just equivalent to the Ābhīras, who had occupied almost the whole of the middle-western part of India, making Mathurā as their capital (cf. under *Cow*). The Yajurveda was mainly written when the Aryans had penetrated into the midland of India. If so, is it not probable that originally the Ābhīras also had Śiva as their God?

Finally, the poet mentions the location of the hundred Rudras. He says, "To them (I hold out) ten (fingers) to the east, ten to the south, ten to the west, ten to the north, and ten upwards."

An Interpretation

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has tried to give a different interpretation of some of the epithets attributed here to Rudra. He observes, "He (Rudra) is called Giriśa or Giritra, "lying on a mountain," probably because the thunderbolt that he hurls, springs from a cloud, which is often compared to a mountain and in which he was believed to dwell...Represented, as Rudra does, the darker powers of nature, he may be expected to dwell away from the habitation of men, and therefore he is called the lord of the paths, of the forests, and of those who roam in them, of thieves and highway robbers, etc....Being the lord of the open fields or plains, he is the lord of cattle (Paśupati) which roam in them. He is called Kapardin, or the wearer of matted hair, which epithet is probably due to his being regarded as identical with Agni, or fire, the fumes of which look like matted hair...Being represented as roaming in forests and other lonely places, the idea of investing him with the skin-clothing of the savage tribes may have suggested itself to a poet."[1]

Partly on account of the absence of the Mohenjo Daro discoveries then, and partly on account of the prevalence of the belief that the Vedic Rudra alone was being exhibited in the *Śatarudriya*, the learned Savant was rather unable to give an appropriate rendering of the *Śatarudriya* hymn. But once the whole of the Mohenjo

1. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, etc.* (Collected Works, Vol. IV), pp. 146–47.

Daro civilization is kept in our view we see in the Śatarudriya the exact working of the Aryan mind—how the Aryans tried to bring close together all the characteristics of Śiva and Rudra. The Śaturudriya is, however, the first of the attempts of the Aryans in this direction.

The Atharvaveda

During the period of the *Atharvaveda* 'Rudra is further developed and elevated to a higher platform [1]. The Veda introduces several other names of the God. It treats Bhava and Śarva[2] as two separate deities. They are called as Bhūtapati (the lord of spirits) and Paśupati (the lord of beasts) respectively.[3] They are described as being thousand-eyed.[4] They are reverenced as being in their domains in the sky and in the middle regions.[5] Five distinct species of animals, kine, horses, men, goats and sheep, are marked off as belonging to Paśupati.[6] To Ugra, the fierce, belong the four intermediate quarters, the sky, the earth and the wide atmosphere, and that which has spirit and breathes on the earth.[7] Bhava sees everything on earth. Nothing is far or near to him. He destroys things in the farther ocean, being himself in the preceding ocean.[8] Bhava is the lord (Īśa) of the heavens, the earth, and fills the whole atmosphere.[9] He is addressed as Rājan.[10] Besides Bhava and Śarva, the other names of Rudra are introduced *i.e.* Sadāśiva, Mahādeva, Paśupati, Īśāna etc. (*Cf. supra* under the Vrātyas).

Eka-vratya and other Features

The *Atharvaveda* is a unique document containing the main features of the civilization of the Vrātyas. We have observed in detail in Chapter II, that the Atharvaveda devotes one whole Book XV over the description of Eka-vrātya, the Supreme Being of the universe. There is also a hymn on Skambha, which is rather an enunciation of the doctrine of the Liṅga, prevalent amongst the early Vrātyas. Besides, the *Atharvaveda* throws light on the early lore of the Vrātyas regarding Kāma, exorcism, magic, Naga, tree-worship and folklore, which possess a great similarity with the Mohenjo Daro civilization. We shall deal with these problems in their respective places.

It should, however, be noted that the Aryans made a first great effort in Aryanizing the God of the non-Aryans, by calling him Eka-vrātya, and supplying him with all the paraphernalia, which was granted him in the Indus Valley period. Especially the use of the three expressions, Eka-vrātya, Puṁscali and Māgadha is important. It is also suggestive that the various gods of the Vedic pantheon are subordinated to this God of the proto-Indians.

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
2. Dr. Venkataramanayya has tried to trace the origin of these two Gods to the Indo-Iranian region. But the theory requires still more further corroboration.
3. *Av*, XI, 2. 1.
4. *Ibid*, IV. 28. 3.
5. *Ibid*. XI. 2. 4.
6. *Ibid*, XI, 2. 9.
7. *Ibid*, XI, 2. 10.
8. *Ibid*, XI, 2. 25.
9. *Ibid*, XI, 2. 27.
10. *Ibid*, XI. 6. 9. cf. for the above, Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

Some other characteristics of Rudra.

The very fact that Rudra was originally a pure Aryan deity may bring us to the conviction that the Aryans must have tried to retain his original characteristics inspite of their attempts made towards identifying him with Śiva in the post-Ṛgvedic period. As has been observed above, the Vedic Brahmins tried to introduce many of the characteristics of Śiva in the case of Rudra. But while doing so they never lost sight of their own deity, so much so, that even the God of the Mohenjo Darians was moulded in later times in a manner that would suit their own purpose.

It is worth noting that the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa makes a mention of Śiva.[1] The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* describes the eight Vasus, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Heaven and Earth, and Prajāpati.[2] The *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* describes thirty-three Rudras instead of the usual eleven. The *Śatapatha* even divides the oblations amongst these three sets of deities: 'the morning offering belonging to Vasus, the mid-day one to (Indra and) the Rudras, the third to the Ādityas with the Vasus and the Rudras, together.[3] Further it is stated that Rudra is the God of cattle, and that when the other gods went to heaven by means of sacrifices he remained on earth; and that his local names are Śarva, Bhava (lord of beasts), Rudra and Agni.'[4] We shall now deal with some of the other aspects of Rudra.

Rudra and Agni

In the *Ṛgveda* itself there are some stanzas which indicate the close association of Rudra and Agni. Here are a few ones wherein Agni is described or styled as Rudra:

(1) "Thou, who art skilled in praise, utter, therefore, for every house, beautiful hymn to the adorable, the terrible (Rudra)." Both Sāyaṇa and Roth agree in calling Rudra as an epithet of Agni here.[5]

(2) "Thou, Agni art Rudra, the great spirit Asura of the sky. Thou art the host of the Maruts. Thou art Lord of nourishment. Thou, who hath a pleasant abode, movest onward with the ruddy winds."[6]

(3) Rv. III, 2. 5 and Rv. VIII, 61. 3 describe Rudra as an epithet of Agni.

Rudra as Agni and a God

The following stanzas describe the name of Rudra as forming both the epithet of Agni and an independent God:

(1) "Before the thunderbolt (falls) unawares, call to your succour Agni, the terrible (Rudra) king of sacrifice, the invoker in both worlds, offering genuine worship, the golden-formed, etc."[7]

Or again,

(2) "Wilt thou, Agni who delightest in the altars, with them declare (one sin) to Vāta, the energetic, the bestower of blessings, the truthful? Wilt thou declare it to be the earth, and to the man-slaying Rudra?"

1. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 217.
2. *Śatapatha Brāhmana*, I, 6. 4. 2; IV, 5. 7. 2 ff.
3. *Ibid*, I, 3. 4. 12; IV, 3. 5. 1.
4. *Ibid*, I, 7. 38.; *Mait. Saṁ* I, 66.
5. *Rv.*, I, 27. 10; *Sv.* I,15; *Nir.*X 8; Roth (illustration of *Nirukta*), p. 136.
6. *Rv.*, II,1.6.
7. *Rv.*, IV.3.1.

In the post-Vedic period this becomes a marked feature of Rudra. The *Yajurveda* ascribes to him the names of Śarva and Bhava,[1] though in the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra* they are considered as the sons of Mahādeva.[2] Further the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* details that the various forms of Agni are also: 'Aśani, Paśupati, Bhava, Śarva, Mahādeva, Īśāna and Ugradeva.'[3] The Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras give the following as names of Agni: Rudra, Śarva, Paśupati, Ugra, Aśani, Bhava and Mahādeva.[4] The *Āśvalāyana Gṛhya-sūtra* gives a further list of names e.g. Hara, Mṛḍa, Śava, Śiva, Bhava, Paśupati, Rudra, Śaṅkara and Īśāna. The passage in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is still more interesting. It runs as: "Agni is a God. These are his names: Śarva, as the eastern people call him, Bhava, as the Bāhīkas, Paśūnāmpati, Rudra and Agni. These other names of his (*i.e.* all the foregoing except Agni) are ungentle." The passage is of special interest because it shows the wide prevalence of the worship of Rudra-Śiva. The post-Vedic Rudra is not only an identification of Rudra, but that an effort was being made to absorb the god of the Bāhīkas and other tribes (who is the same as that of the Mohenjo Darians) into their own pantheon. Again, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* in 6, 1, 3, 7 ff, while narrating the birth of Rudra, identifies him with Agni. This tradition is also maintained in the Purāṇas. (Cf. *infra.*)

Birth of Rudra

Once Rudra in conjunction with Śiva began to attain prominence in the post-Vedic period, we find that various attempts were made to trace the origin of this mighty god.

(1). The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[5] gives an interesting story: "This foundation existed. It became the earth (*bhūmi*). He extended it (*aprathayat*). It became the broad one (pṛthivī). On this foundation beings and the Lord of beings consecrated themselves for the year (saṁvatsara). The lord of beings was a householder, and Uṣas was his wife. Now these beings were the seasons. That 'lord of beings' was the year. That wife Uṣas was Auṣasī (the daughter of the dawn). Then both these beings, and that lord of beings, the year, impregnated Uṣas, and a boy (Kumāra) was born in a year. The boy wept. Prajāpati said to him, 'Boy, why dost thou weep, since thou hast been born after toil and austerity?' The boy said, 'My evil has not been indeed taken away; and a name has not been given to me. Give me a name. Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou art Rudra.' In as much as he gave him that name Agni became his form, for Rudra is Agni. He was Rudra because he wept (*arōdīt* from '*rud*', to weep). The boy said, 'I am greater than one who does not exist: give me a name.' Prajāpati replied, 'Thou art Śarva'. In as much as he gave him that name, the waters became his form, for Śarva (All) is the waters, because all this is produced from the waters. The boy said (again), 'give me a name.' The boy said, 'I am......, give me a name.' Prajāpati replied, 'Thou art Paśupati.' In as much as he gave him that name, the plants became his form, for Paśupati is the plants. Hence, when beasts obtain plants, they become lords (or strong)

1. *Vā. Saṁ.*, XVI, 18, 28.
2. Muir, *O.S.T.*, IV,20,1. Note also Keith, ***Religion and Philosophy of the Veda***, I, 144. cf. also 'Arbmann Rudra, p. 29. He most arbitrarily asserts that these Gods were originally identical with Rudra, who was worshipped outside the Vedic circles.
3. *Vāj. Saṁ.*, XXXIX, 8.
4. *Śata. Br.*, VI, 103.7; *K.B.*, VI,1ff.
5. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 6. 1. 3. 7 ff.

Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou art Ugra.' In as much as he gave him that name Vāyu (the wind) became his form. For Ugra (or the fierce) is Vāyu. Therefore when it blows strongly, men say, 'Ugra blows.' The boy said—'give me a name'. Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou art Aśani.' In as much as he gave him that name Vidyut (lightning) became his form. For Aśani is lightning. Hence say they that Aśani has struck a man whom lightning strikes. The boy said, 'I am greater than one who does not exist; give me a name.' Prajāpati said to him, 'Thou art Bhava.' In as much as he gave him that name, Parjanya (the god of rain) became his form. For Bhava (Being) is Parjanya; because all this (universe) springs from Parjanya. The boy said (again)-'give me a name.' Prajāpati replied, 'Thou art Mahān-devaḥ (the Great God).' In as much as he gave him that name, Candramas (Moon) became his form. For the Moon is *Prajāpati*: the 'Great God' is *Prajāpati*. The boy said (again)—'give me a name.' Prajāpati replied, 'Thou art Īśāna (the ruler).' In as much as he gave him that name, Āditya (the Sun) became his form. For Īśāna is the Sun, because he rules (*iṣṭe*) over this universe. The boy said, 'I am so much: do not give me any further name.' These are the eight forms of Agni. Kumāra is the ninth. This is the three-foldness of Agni. Since there are, as it were, eight forms of Agni, (and) the *Gāyatrī* metre has eight syllables, men say, 'Agni pertains to the Gāyatrī.' This boy (Kumāra) entered into the forms. Men do not see Agni as a boy; it is these forms of his that they see; for he entered into these forms."

This is more or less a Brāhmanic version regarding the interpretations of the various names of Rudra. It indirectly throws light on the early eight forms of Śiva in the Mohenjo Daro period.

(2). The same work gives another version in regard to the birth of Rudra:[1]

"From Prajāpati, when he had become enfeebled, the deities departed, only one god, Manyu, did not leave him, but continued extended within him. He (Prajāpati) wept. The tears which fell from him remained in that Manyu. He became Rudra with a hundred heads, a hundred eyes, and a hundred quivers. Then the other drops which fell from him in unnumbered thousands entered into these worlds. They were called Rudras because they sprang from him when he had wept. This Rudra with a thousand heads, eyes and quivers, stood demanding food. The gods were afraid of him. They said to Prajāpati, 'We are afraid of this being, lest he destroy us.' Prajāpati said to them, 'Collect for him food and with it appease him.' They collected for him this food, the *Śatarudriya*, and with it they appeased him. From the fact that with this they appeased the hundred-headed Rudra, it is 'that wherewith the hundred-headed Rudra is to be appeased' (Śata-śirṣa-Rudra-śamanīyam). This they esoterically call *Śatarudriya*; for the Gods love that is esoteric.—'Reverence also to thy arrow and thine arms'. He (the god) stood causing terror with his arrow and arms."

(3). The *Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*[2] gives a version slightly different from No. 1 of the *Śatapatha*.

"Prajāpati, being desirous of progeny, performed austerity. From him, when he had (thus) performed austerity, five (children) were born, Agni, Vāyu, Āditya,

1. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, IX. 1, 1, 6, ff.

2. *Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*, VI. 1, etc.

Candramas (Moon), and Uṣas (dawn) the fifth. He said to them, 'Do you also perform austerity.' They consecrated themselves. Before them, when they had consecrated themselves and had performed austerity, Uṣas, the daughter of Prajāpati, assuming the form of an Apsaras (a celestial nymph) rose up. Their attention was riveted upon her, and they discharged seed. Then they came to Prajāpati, their father, and said to him, 'We have discharged seed, let it not lie there in vain.' Prajāpati made a golden platter, of the depth of an arrow, and of equal breadth. In this he collected the seed, and from it there arose a being with a thousand eyes, a thousand feet and a thousand arrows on the string. He came to his father Prajāpati, who asked him, 'Why dost thou come to me?' He answered, 'Give me a name. I shall not eat this food, so long as no name has been given to me.' 'Thou art Bhava,' said Prajāpati; for Bhava is the Waters. Therefore Bhava does not slay this man, nor his offspring, nor his cattle, nor any (creature of his) who speaks. And further who-so-ever hates him is most wicked. Such is not the case with him who knows this. His rule is, eat a man, wear a garment. Again he went to Prajāpati seven times more for a name and Prajāpati gave him the following names. 'Śarva, (Śarva is Agni), Paśupati (Paśupati is Vāyu), Ugradeva (Ugradeva is plants and trees), Mahān-deva (Mahān-deva is Āditya), Candramas (the Moon), Īśāna (Īśāna is Lord), and Aśani (Aśani is Indra),' Finally, the Brāhmaṇa reads, "This is Mahādeva (great God), who has eight names, and who is formed in eight ways. The progeny to the eighth generation of the man who possesses this knowledge, eats food, and ever wealthier and wealthier men will be born among his descendants."

This is all a fantastic tale of the Brāhman writers. The first version narrates the story of Kumāra, and it is also explained as a myth dealing with the birth of Kārttikeya or Subrahmaṇya. But there is one point which is worth noting, namely that Rudra was waxing strong on account of the various epithets attributed to him These became the common property of Rudra-Śiva in the Purāṇic period. Nextly, the number of the names of Rudra mentioned here is important. The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions describe Śiva as being eight-formed. We think that the number eight mentioned here is also a reminiscence of the older tradition-the exact original meaning of which was absolutely forgotten in the time of the Brāhmaṇas.

Other aspects

A. Berriedale Keith observes, that, 'in the Brāhmaṇas we find the power of Rudra was at its height.'[1] The *Aitareya*[2] *Brāhmaṇa* narrates a story in which Rudra is shown to be an 'embodiment of all dread forms', and of whom even the gods were afraid. The story proceeds :

"Prajāpati felt love towards his own daughter, the Sky, some say, Uṣas, others. Having become a stag he approached her in the form of a deer. The gods said of him, 'A deed unknown Prajāpati now does.' They sought one to punish him; they found him not among one another. Those most dread forms they brought together in one place. Brought together they became this deity here. To him the gods said, 'Prajāpati here hath done a deed unknown; pierce him.' 'Be it so', he

1. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, I, p. 144.
2. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, Adh. 13, 9th and 10th Khaṇḍas; Keith, *Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas* (*Trans*); C. V. N. Ayyar, *Śaivism in South India*, pp. 20–21.

replied, 'Let me choose a boon from you.' 'Choose,' (they said). He chose...the overlordship of cattle.... Having aimed at him he pierced at him (Prajāpati); being pierced he flew upwards....The seed of Prajāpati outpoured ran; it became a pond.... It they surrounded with Agni.... Then Agni Vaiśvānara caused it to move. The first part of it...became yonder Āditya; the second became Bhṛgu. The third... became the Ādityas. The coals became the Aṅgirasas... The extinguished coal became black cattle; the reddened earth ruddy (cattle). The ash which was there crept about in diverse forms, the buffalo, the 'gayal,' the antelope, the camel, the ass and these ruddy animals. To them this god said, 'Mine is this, mine is what remains.' Him they deprived of a claim by this verse which is recited as addressed to Rudra, 'O father of the Maruts, let thy good will approach us; do thou not sever us from the sight of the Sun; Do thou, O here, be merciful to *our steeds'*; so should he say not 'towards us' (in the last line); this god is not likely to attack offspring then—'May we be multiplied with children, 'O thou of Rudra,' so should he say, not 'O Rudra,' to avoid the use of the actual name. Or rather he should recite, 'Weal for us let him make', with 'weal' he begins, for all.... This verse being without mention (of the name of the deity) though addressed to Rudra is appeased (Śānta)...."

As we have observed above, the original meaning of the expression 'Paśupati was entirely lost sight of during the Brāhmaṇic period, and that the word Paśu became more or less equivalent to its ordinary meaning 'cattle' – instead of its original connotation e.g. '*lāñcchana*.' Apart from this, the above story is a strong corroboration of the fact how Rudra was considered as a fierce deity, being possessed of a powe. even of bringing the gods under control. Again, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* "reveals Rudra as a great black being who appears in the place of sacrifice, and claims all that is over as his own, a claim which Nābhānediṣṭha is told by his father must be recognized as valid.[1] In our opinion, this is but a reminiscence of the fact that Śiva was not allowed any place in the original sacrificial system of the Brāhmaṇas, though the Vedic Rudra was admitted. But when a fusion of both the racial and socia ideas began to take place gradually, the new Rudra was at last being given such a place though so low.

Rudra in the Ritual

Keith very beautifully summarizes the whole position: "In the ritual we find that he is marked out emphatically from the other gods: at the end of the sacrifice a handful of the *straw* is offered to him to propitiate him,[2] at the end of a meal any food left over is placed in a spot to the north for him to take:[3] his abode is in the north, while the other gods abide in the east, the place of the rising of the sun. The bloody entrails of the victim are made over to his hosts, which attack men and beast with disease and death in order to avert their anger.[4] Moreover, the snakes[5] are clearly conceived as being among his servants, which fact strongly corroborates *the close association of Śiva with the serpent* in the Mohenjo Daro period

1. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, V.14.
2. *G.G.S.*, 1.8.15.
3. *Āp Ds*, II.2423.
4. *Ś. Ś. S.*, IV. 198; cf. *A.B.*, II.71.
5. *A. G. S.*, IV, 8,28,

When the gods reached heaven, it is said Rudra was left behind. In a place infested by snakes one should offer to Rudra who is lord of cattle, in a river to Rudra who lives in the waters, at a crossway to Rudra of the roads, at sacred trees, at the place of sacrifice and so on[2]—. "Another sign of the greatness of Rudra is found in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*.[3] It is prescribed that a formula must be altered from the form in which it occurs in the *Ṛgveda* in order to avoid the direct mention of the name of the god : this is clear proof of advance in the conception of him since the *Ṛgveda*. In another passage[4] of the same text he is never named, but is referred to as 'the god here,' and the same avoidance of direct use of the name is to be seen elsewhere."[5]

The Śūlagava sacrifice

The *Gṛhyasūtras* describe in detail the performance of the Śūlagava sacrifice. It is to be performed in the bright-half of the month on an auspicious Nakṣatra (*H*), in autumn or spring under the Ardhanakṣatra (*P*). Prof. Apte observes that some Gṛhyasūtras give a description of the Śūlagava which has nothing to do with the killing of the victim (*H. Ā.* and *P.*). The sacrifice of the spit-ox, etc. is described in the *A* and *P. G. S.* The rite may be summarized in the following manner :

'A bull is sacrificed to Rudra to appease him.[6] The rite should be performed beyond the limits of a village, and its remains should not be brought into it. The Vapā, or omentum, should be sacrificed to Rudra by uttering twelve names. Aśani is omitted, and five more names are added e.g. Hara, Mṛḍa, Śiva, Bhīma and Śaṅkara. Or the Vapā may be thrown into the fire by uttering six specific names only or the single name Rudra. This Śūlagava sacrifice should be performed in a cow-shed when a cattle disease has to be averted. In *P.G.*[7] the names uttered in throwing the oblations are of the wives Indrāṇī, Rudrāṇī, Śarvāṇī and Bhavānī. *H.G.*[8] has the same deities as the eight mentioned above, Bhīma being substituted for Aśani ; and oblations are given to the wife of each by repeating the formula : "*Bhavasya Devasya patnyai svāhā*" (to the wife of God Bhava) etc., and not by uttering their proper names.'[9]

Thus the post-Vedic period shows a clear tendency towards amalgamating the two cults of Rudra and Śiva. Again, as we shall observe in Part V, Rudra also becomes a philosophical entity during the Upaniṣadic period. Thus, side by side with the Gṛhyasūtras, the Upaniṣads and the Epics also endow Rudra with many qualities which originally belonged only to the sphere of the monotheistic deity Śiva of the proto-Indians. But the Brāhman writers have tried to subordinate the position of Rudra-Śiva by introducing him as the third entity in the Hindu Trinity. We shall see how they did it later on.

1. *Śatapatha Br.* I, 7, 3, 1.
2. *H. G. S.*, I, 16, 8, ff.
3. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 34, 7.
4. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III 33 ; cf. Hirzel, *Der Name*, pp. 15 ff.
5. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, II, pp. 145-46.
6. *A. G.*, IV. 9.
7. *P. G.*, III, 8.
8. *H. G.*, I, 3. 8.
9. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (*Collected Works*, IV), p. 150.

IV

Śiva-Rudra in the Epic and Purāṇic Period

Introductory—Sectarian rivalry—Hindu Trinity—Hari—Hara-Main characteristics—Birth—Corporeal aspects—Epithets—Residence—His skin garment—Nīlakaṇṭha—Wearer of garland of skulls—Śiva and Gaṅgā—His three eyes—Śiva and Moon—Śiva and tribes—As Paśupati—As Creator, Preserver and Destroyer—As Ardhanārīśvara—As Dancer—As an Ascetic and Philosopher—Śiva and Kāma—Śiva and Liṅga—Eight forms—Gaṇas—Destroyer of demons—Bestower of favour—Eleven Rudras—Vīrabhadra—Bhairava—Aṣṭa-dikpālas-Śiva, Vedas and Avatāras—Conclusion.

Introductory

The history of Śiva during the Epic and Purāṇic period is of an absorbing interest. Really speaking, there is not such a wide gulf existing between these two types of literature. We find that the working of the Purāṇic writers looks as if a continuation of what is contained in the Epics. In the Epics the formation of the basis of the future mythology takes place. The position of Śiva-Ruda is subordinated to that of Brahmā and Viṣṇu. Śiva is now brought into direct contact with the other Brāhmaṇic gods. It is said that Satī, the daughter of Dakṣa, was married to Śiva. Later on Satī in her next birth again marries him. Now she is called Umā, Pārvatī, or Haimavatī. Śiva becomes the bearer of the moon and the serpent, and a dweller in the cemetery (*smaśāna*) mainly encircled by goblins (*Bhūtas, Piśācas*) and Rudras who are alike in form and dress. Śiva's main place of residence becomes Kailāsa. The Liṅga cult becomes closely associated with Śaivism in general.

There is really another interesting feature. As Aryanism began to spread in the various parts of India, it must have brought in more converts from the section of the Vrātyas. And one total effect of the same seems to have been a merging together of the old and the new-the Vrātyan and the Aryan. The Aryans have poured old wine of wisdom in their new bottles. This is more perceptible in the sphere of religion. The old gods with all their paraphernalia – though in a new garb – appear on the scene again. The addition of newer gods like Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Indra and others have added a new colour altogether. It is an interesting episode that these various gods began to lead a family life, and do things which are expected to be done only in this mundane world. It is a full-fledged mythology that is placed before us. Much of it is due to the sectarian rivalry that came into existence during this period.

However, the old characteristics of Śiva during the Indus Valley period are attributed to the new personality of Rudra-Śiva. Thus the epic and Purāṇic Rudra is a combination of the Vedic and non-Vedic notions. Hence, the early notions of Śiva as a dancer, an ascetic and a Yogin, a god of the Himālayas, one possessed of three eyes and others, are all endowed to the Śiva-Rudra of the Vedic and Brāhmaṇic period. It should be borne in mind that all these elements are not an innovation but they are introduced only as a matter of revision of the past.

Certain new ideas have been ushered in this period e.g. Hari-Hara, marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī, Śiva and the Moon, Śiva and the Ganges, the Trimūrti and others.

The Liṅga is worshipped only as an emblem of Śiva. In the absence of the images of Śiva, the Liṅga is supposed to be the representation of Śiva himself.

Rudra now occupies a new position in the creation. He is sometimes supposed to be the product of Brahmā or Hari, and at others he himself becomes a direct creator of the universe. Some other manifestations of this ancient God are introduced e.g. Vīrabhadra, Bhairava, Śiva in the Aṣṭadikpālas, the eleven (*ekādaśa*) Rudras, and others. We shall deal with these problems presently.

Sectarian Rivalry

The most important phase is that sectarian rivalries begin to become more perceptible during this period. Brahmanism as a religion had already come into vogue in its full-fledged colours. In fact, in the end of the period of the Gṛhyasūtras the system of the Cāturvarṇya, the Saṁskāras and the Brāhmanic philosophy had become established facts. Side by side with Brahmā, Viṣṇu also had acquired a prominent place in the Hindu pantheon. Thus it may be safely said that with the period of the Mahābhārata Viṣṇu, along with his ten Avatāras, begins to attain a glorious position.

Before dealing with the problem of the Hindu Trinity we wish to give an instance or two indicating to what extent the sectarian bias had developed during this period The stories of Dakṣa's sacrifice and that of the cutting off of Brahmā's fifth head by Śiva (Brahma-śira-śchedana) will elucidate the whole point.

Daksa and Siva.

The story of the conflict between Daksa and Śiva has been related in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas.[1] The accounts vary in minor details. But the following story detailed in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* shows the keen sense of rivalry existing between the different sects during this period. Briefly narrated the story is as follows:

'All the Gods and Ṛṣis were assembled together at a sacrifice celebrated by the Prajāpati (including Dakṣa). When Dakṣa came in, all present showed their respect to him by rising from their seats, but Brahmā and Mahādeva did not. Daksa was willing to pay his respects to Brahmā, but he was offended with what he regarded as the insolence of Śiva. Then he spoke in anger: "Hear me, Ye Brāhman Ṛṣis, with the Gods and Agnis, while I, neither from ignorance nor from passion, describe what is the practice of virtuous persons. But this shameless being (Śiva) detracts from the reputation of the guardians of the world (Prajāpati)- he, by whom, stubborn as he is, the course pursued by the good is transgressed. He assumed the position of my disciple, in as much as, like a virtuous person in the face of the Brāhmans and of fire he took the hand of my daughter...This monkey-eyed (god) after having taken the hand of (my) fawn-eyed (daughter), has not even by word shown suitable respect to me whom he ought to have risen and saluted. Though unwilling, I yet gave my daughter to this impure and proud abolisher of rites and demolisher of barriers, like the word of the Veda to a Śūdra. He roams about in dreadful cemeteries, attended by hosts of ghosts and spirits, like a mad man, naked, with dishevelled hair, laughing, weeping,

(1) *Mbh. Śānti P.*, Adh 289; *Śiva P. Rudra-saṁhita, Satīkhaṇḍa*, 2, Adh. 43; *Viṣṇu-dharmottara, P.*, Adh. 100, etc. Cf. *Appendix*.

bathed in ashes of funeral piles, wearing a garland of dead men's skulls, and ornaments of human bones, pretending to be Śiva (auspicious), but in reality Aśiva (inauspicious), insane, beloved by the insane, the Lord of Pramathas and Bhūtas, beings whose nature is essentially darkness. To this wicked-hearted lord of the infuriate, whose purity has perished, I have also given my virtuous daughter at the instigation of Brahmā. He follows up this speech by a curse, "Let this Bhava (Śiva) lowest of the gods, never-at the worship of the gods, receive any portion along with the gods Indra, Upendra (Viṣṇu) and others." Then he departed. This action roused the fury of Nandīśvara, the chief follower of Śiva. He cursed in return: "May the ignorant being, who, from regard to this mortal (Dakṣa), and considering Śiva as distinct (from the supreme spirit), hates the deity who does not return hatred, be averse to truth. Devoted to domestic life, in which frauds are prevalent, let him form a desire of vulgar passions, practise the round of ceremonies, with an understanding degraded by Vedic prescriptions. Forgetting the nature of the soul, with a mind which contemplates other things, let Daksa brutal, be excessively devoted to women, and have speedily the face of a goat. Let this stupid being, who has a conceit of knowledge, and all those who follow this contemner of Śarva (Śiva), continue to exist in this world in ceremonial ignorance. Let the enemies of Hara (Śiva), whose minds are disturbed by the strong spirituous odour and the excitement of the flowery words of the Veda, become deluded. Let those Brāhmans eating all sorts of food, professing knowledge and practising austerities and cere monies (merely) for subsistence delighting in riches and in corporeal and sensual enjoyments, wander about as beggars. This curse rouses the anger of Bhṛgu who delivers in his turn the following curse: "Let those who practise the rites of Bhava and all their followers be heretics and opponents of the true scriptures. Having lost their purity, deluded in understanding, wearing matted hair and ashes and bones, let them undergo the initiation of Śiva, in which spirituous liquor is the deity. Since ye revile the Veda and the Brāhmaṇas, the barriers by which men are restrained, ye, have embraced heresy. For this (Veda) is the auspicious (Śiva) eternal path of the virtuous, follows the heresy in which your god is the king of the goblins." Śiva went away with his followers and Dakṣa and other Prajāpatis celebrated for a thousand years the sacrifice in which Viṣṇu was the object of adoration.

'It was this humiliation and disgrace of Śiva that apparently made Dakṣa neglect Śiva when he invited all the gods to the sacrifice he individually celebrated. Satī (Umā) requests her husband to permit her to go to the sacrifice performed by Dakṣa. Śiva warns her that she would be insulted. In spite of this warning she goes and is slighted by her father. Remonstrating in vain with Dakṣa to change his attitude towards Śiva, she 'gives up the ghost'. Śiva's followers, who had accompanied Satī, were prevented by a *mantra* of Bhṛgu from destroying the sacrifice. They returned to narrate the tale to Śiva, who, in his wrath, created out of a lock of his hair a terrible spirit who led Śiva's followers to the scene of sacrifice and destroyed it. Further Śiva is said to have plucked out the beard of Bhṛgu, who was pouring oblations into the fire, 'tore out the eyes of Bhava, and knocked out the teeth of Pūṣan, cut off Dakṣa's head and replaced it by the one of a goat. Ultimately Dakṣa came to Śiva for succour.'[1]

1. Cf. Muir, *O.S.T.*, IV, 382.

Siva and Brahma

The story of Śiva's cutting off of Brahmā's fifth head is a sheer invention and throws light on the sectarian rivalry existing between the Śaivas and Brahmā's worshippers. It is of free and common occurrence in the Purāṇas[1]. We wish to detail two versions of the story below:

'The *Varāha Purāṇa* narrates that Brahmā created Rudra, and addressing him as Kāpāli, asked him to project the world. Because he was insulted as Kapāli, Śiva cut off the fifth head of Brahmā with his left thumb-nail; but this head stuck to his hand and would not fall off from it. Then Brahmā was requested by Rudra to tell him how he could get rid of the head stuck up in his hand, for which Brahmā prescribed to Rudra the observance of the Kāpālika's life for twelve years, at the end of which he promised that the head would fall off. Then Rudra repaired to Mahendragiri and wearing a *Yajñopavīta* made of hair, a garland of beads made of bone, and a piece of the skull tied up as an ornament in the *Jaṭāmakuṭa* on his head and carrying a skull filled with blood in his hand, went round the earth visiting all places of pilgrimage. At the end of twelve years he arrived at Vārāṇasī, where, by the followers of Simacari (?) the skull of Brahmā was removed from the hand of Rudra. The place where the head fell obtained the name of Kapāla-mocana. Rudra then bathed in the Ganges, worshipped Viśveśvara at Kāśī and returned to Kailāsa.'

The *Kūrma Purāṇa* gives a different version: 'Once upon a time the Ṛṣis asked Brahmā as to who was the origin of the universe. Brahmā arrogated it to himself. Just then Śiva appeared on the scene and claimed to be the originator of the universe. Upon this there ensued a dispute between Brahmā and Śiva. Even though the Vedas came to declare that Śiva was the greatest of all Gods Brahmā would not accept their verdict. Then appeared in space a huge illumination in which was discernible the figure of Śiva. Śiva then ordered Bhairava to cut off that fifth head of Brahmā which spoke to him with haughtiness and disrespect. By the power of his *Yoga*, Brahmā escaped death; and he also learnt at the sacrifice of one of his heads the superiority of Śiva.'

However, we shall have a clearer vision regarding these sectarian conflicts under the topic of Hindu Trinity.

The Hindu Trinity

We have already observed how the three-faced figure of Śiva must have acted as a source of inspiration to the Brāhmans for introducing the figures of Brahmā and Viṣṇu also into the same. Moreover, during the period of the *Mahābhārata* we find that the sectarian feelings had become rampant, and that the two deities Viṣṇu and Brahmā had attained a unique prominence.

Thus as a solution towards overcoming these sectarian conflicts that the Brāhman thinkers must have thought of causing an amalgamation of these deities at an earlier date. So in the time of the *Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad*,[2] we find that all the three

1. *Skānda P., Brahmakhaṇḍa, Setu-Māhātmya*, 23-24 ff; *Padma P., Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa*, 14 105 ff; *Vāmana P.*, Adh, 2; *Kūrma P. Uttarabhāga*, Adh, 31; *Varāha P.*, etc.
2. *Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad*, IV 1-5; cf. also *Prāṇāgnihoma, Brāhma, Rāmottaratapanīya* and *Nṛsiṁhottaratapanīya Upaniṣads*.

9

gods are mentioned together. The Upanisad states that Brahmā, Rudra and Viṣṇu appear as forms (tanavaḥ) of the absolute, which itself is incorporeal, and again they are declared to correspond in respect with the *rajas*, *tamas*, and *sattva* aspects of the absolute. The Calcutta Edition of the *Mahābhārata* already speaks of Viṣṇu and Brahmā as having arisen from the right and left sides of Śiva.

That the idea of the three-faced figure of Śiva alone came into vogue originally can be very well perceived from the early representations of Śiva on the Kushano-Sasanian coins, on one of the coins of Huvishka, and from those images found at Mathurā and other places. However, different views are expressed regarding the age of the introduction of the notion of Trimūrti. Natesh Ayyar maintains that, 'the conception of the Hindu Triad does not seem to have come into vogue until the advent of the Purāṇic period, for in the time of Yāska the deities who were generally grouped together as the Triad are not Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, but Agni, Vāyu or Indra, and Sūrya.'[1] Bhattacharya points out that, 'the idea of Trinity is as ancient as the time of the Vedas. The Vedic triad Agni, Vāyu or Indra and Sūrya in fact takes the place of Brahmā, Śiva and Viṣṇu (as Sūrya), the last being met with in the Trinity sculpture of the Indian Museum.'[2] Barth expresses the view that, 'of the different combinations to which speculation was thus led, there is one that is connected more closely than the rest with the prior conceptions of Brahmanism. It is that of the Hindu Trinity, in which Śiva and Viṣṇu are associated with Brahmā in a way to form along with him the three-fold impersonation of the Supreme Brahmā. This constitutes in some degree a solution midway between the ancient orthodoxy in its final form and the new religions; it is at the same time the most considerable attempt which has been made to reconcile these religions to one another. That is to say, in our regard it does not seek to show a first stepping stone, as it were, towards the sectarian belief, the existence of which, on the contrary, it presupposes.'[3] Creuzer thought that he had discovered the primitive dogma of India in the notion of Trimūrti.[4] However, none of these theories becomes convincing to us especially when they are viewed from the contents of the Mohenjo Daro discoveries.

Mutual Relationship

It is also interesting to study the mutual relationship that existed between the various gods. As we shall observe in Part IV, once Viṣṇu is made the Supreme Godhead (Triprathamam), on another occasion Brahmā, and on the third Śiva respectively. Besides, it is at times shown how suddenly a fight may ensue between them. Many a passage in the Epics and the Purāṇas deal with the topic of the mutual adoration that the gods may feel and express towards each other. In the *Mahābhārata* it is expressed how Kṛṣṇa went to the Kailāsa mountain to meet Śiva.

The three gods are very often described as representing the three *guṇas* or qualities: Sattva (Brahmā), Rajas (Viṣṇu) and Tamas (Rudra). The three gods are

1. Natesh Ayyar, 'Trimurtis in Bundelkhanda', *I.A.*, May, 1918.
2. Bhattacharya, *Indian Images*, pp. 45 ff.
3. Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 179.
4. Creuzer, *Symbolik*, t. i. p. 568 (2nd Ed.).

said to be acting as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. Thus they are described as 'the personification of the three forces of integration, disintegration and reintegration. They differ from, and are superior to, all other divine and human organisms, in that they are not subject to transmigration.'[1] The Gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva are each represented by one of the three letters *a.u.m*, the combination of which forms the *sacro-sanct* syllable *Om*, the symbol of the Absolute. Sometimes, the triangle (*trikoṇa*) is also used to symbolize this triune co-equality.

With the introduction of the idea of the Hindu Trinity of the three male gods, we find that even their counterparts begin to attain the same supreme significance in the Hindu pantheon. We have already discussed the problem of the early representations of Śiva at the beginning of this chapter.

Hari-Hara

Perhaps side by side with the notion of the Hindu Trinity that of Harihara also seems to have come into vogue. The *Harivaṁśa* for the first time refers to it.[2] The Purāṇas, however, relate many stories regarding the fact how the two gods Hari and Hara became one. It is said that after the marriage of Gaurī with Rudra took place, a fight ensued between Hari and Hara. Brahmā intervened and said, 'Let both of you be of established reputation as Harihara. Therefore both of them are located on the Raivataka mountain.'[3] The *Liṅga* P. narrates another interesting story, namely, that, Viṣṇu had been to the Dāruvana in the guise of a woman, and that then they became one.'[4] The *Nāradīya P.* also makes Kṛṣṇa and Śiva, instead of Viṣṇu and Śiva, to assume the form of Harihara. According to this version Śiva has five faces and Kṛṣṇa has four only[5]. Later on it is even said that a son called Hariharaputra was born to Śiva and Viṣṇu. The various Purāṇic passages narrate how both the Gods Hari and Hara are the same, though two in outward appearance. It is repeatedly told that either of them meditates on the form of the other, and that they reside in each other's heart. Further it becomes perfectly clear from the Mahābhārata how the appellations of the one are attributed to the other. There are many sculptural representations and shrines of Harihara in Southern India.

Main Characteristics

The *Mahābhārata* and some of the *Purāṇas* give a long list of the 1008 names of Śiva.[6] With the advent of this period Śiva begins to attain a peculiar position in the Hindu pantheon. In fact he is given a definite place in the Hindu Trinity, a definite birth-story and a definite personality, with the aid of which he could carry on his *manœuvres* in the world of Gods. It should also be noted that many a time a definite distinction is made between Mahādēva and Rudra, who are said to belong to the higher and lower spheres of philosophical thought.

The Purāṇas have enriched the whole field of Vrātya mythology. Monier Williams rightly observes: "God Śiva never passed through the process of birth, childhood, manhood, or any of the stages of a recognized human existence in the way

1. Monier Williams. *op. cit.*, p.46.
2. *Harivaṁśa*, II, Adh. 129, 40 ff.
3. *Skānda P. VII*, 2, 17, 185 ff.
4. *Liṅga P.*, *Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 96
5. *Nāradīya Mahā-P.*, Adh. 83, 23 ff.
6. *Mbh. Anuśāsana P.*, XVII ; *Śiva P.* LXIX.

that Rāma and Kṛṣṇa did; yet he has his local incarnations, and irrespective of these a distinct personality of his own, and a biography capable of being written with more precision than that of Viṣṇu, by putting together the allusions and descriptions in the Epic poems and Purāṇas."[1] We shall now examine the various problems in regard to Śiva's appurtenance, his residence, his life and personality, and other allied topics.

Birth of Siva

Many of the Purāṇic passages describe that Rudra was born from the forehead of Brahmā. It is further stated that this figure of Rudra was androgynous and that upon the order of Brahmā it divided itself into ten and one parts, the female part being called *Śatarūpā*. It should also be noted that Śiva is so often identified with Fire (Agni or Anila), who is called the son of Brahma. (Cf. under *Rudras*).

His Corporeal Aspects

With regard to the bodily form, mode of life and behaviour attributed to Śiva in his later character, it may be said that much of the lore has been borrowed from the materials obtaining during the proto-Indian period and in the *Śatarudriya*.

Śiva is sometimes described as having seven, five (*Pañcānana*), four, three faces, or sometimes one. He is described as having three eyes. He is said to bear the crescent just above the third eye. He wears a necklace of skulls and is covered with ashes, and his hair are thickly matted together and gathered above his forehead into a coil so as to project like a horn. Sometimes Śiva is designated as Triśikhī (possessing three matted locks of hair). Śiva is described as wearing either the skin of an elephant, a tiger, a lion, or a deer. Śiva's blue throat is described as Nīlakaṇṭha, Śitikaṇṭha, Tamālakaṇṭha, etc. He is described as either of a dark or a white (Śveta) complexion. Śiva is said to ride on a white bull (called Nandī), which also happens to decorate his banner (cf. under *Nandī*).

Śiva is armed 'with special weapons, suited to his warlike needs,' a three-pronged trident (*triśūla*), a bow called as *ajagava* or *Pināka*, a thunderbolt (*Vajra*), an axe (*Kuṭhāra*)[2] or (*Khaṇḍa-paraśu*), a non-descript weapon called *Khaṭvāṅga*, consisting of a kind of staff with transverse pieces surrounded by a skull. Śiva is described as holding a noose (*pāśa*), a conch-shell (*Śaṅkha*), *ḍamaru* (a kind of rattle or drum shaped like an hour-glass), which he uses as a musical instrument to keep time while dancing.' Śiva is designated as a Bilvadaṇḍin (or the bearer of the Bilva-daṇḍa). He is said to be the bearer of a Kapala (Kapālin). With this brief survey we shall now describe the significance of some of the most important epithets and aspects of Śiva.

Epithets of Siva

In the Epic and the Purāṇic period various epithets are attributed to Śiva. The *Anuśāsanā Parva* and some of the Purāṇas detail the 1008 names of Śiva. These names include also those originally attributed to the other gods Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Sūrya, etc. The following are some of the main epithets of Śiva:

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 78.
2. *Skānda P., Nāgarakhaṇḍa*, 93,1. Cf. *Appendix*.

Tryambaka, Agni, Aśani, Paśupati, Bhava, Śarva, Īśāna, Mahādeva, Ugradeva, Citta, Auṣiṣṭahan, Bhīma, Nīlakaṇṭha, Śitikaṇṭha, Kapardin, Muṇḍin, Sahasrākṣa, Śatadhanvan, Kumāra, Bahurūpa, Surūpa, Suvarcas, Trilocana, Bhāsvara, Virūpākṣa, Vasuretaḥ. Sahasraśiras, Sahasracaraṇa, Jaṭila, Vajrahasta, Digvāsas, Gaura, Hiraṇyagarbha, Sāmba-Rudra, Daṇḍa, Caṇḍa, Bhairava, Aṇu, Kadru, Mṛtyuñjaya, Brahmagarbha, Śaṅkara, Śiva, etc. It is worth noting that this list also includes all the epithets attributed to Rudra in the Brāhmaṇic period.

Siva's residence

During this period, the abode of Śiva and Pārvatī becomes the Kailāsa in the Himālayas. 'He resides there in the company of innumerable servants or troops (Gaṇas) and Kubera (God of Wealth), who is surrounded by the Yakṣas. All the three gods, namly, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva are endowed with their own worlds e.g. Brahmaloka, Vaikuṇṭha and Kailāsa respectively. Various descriptions are given in regard to the location and extension of these worlds. We have already observed that the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions mention the white Mountain (Himālaya) as the place of residence of Śiva. Further the *Śatarudriya* refers to Rudra–Śiva as Giriśa, Giritra, etc. Eventually this idea must have later on developed itself. And it is thus that Śiva is endowed with the Kailāsa as his abode.

Siva's Skin-Garment

The Purāṇas relate various legends indicating how Śiva came to wear the different skin-garments e.g. of a tiger, or a lion or an elephant. The *Liṅga P.* says that he assumed the form of a tiger and killed the demon, and that, therefore, he is called Vyāghreśvara.[1] Some of the other legends relate that Śiva assumed the form of a Śarabha, removed the skin of Narasiṁha and wore it.[2] A third form of the legends relate that Śiva is called as the wearer of an elephant's skin because he began to wear it after killing the elephant demon[3]. The word Kṛttivāsas (wearer of a skin-garment) denoting Śiva is used in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[4] and the *Śatarudriya*.[5] The *Amarakośa* interprets it as meaning 'clad in a skin'. It is of common occurrence in the Purāṇas. Śiva is already depicted as a Yogin and an ascetic in the Mohenjo Daro period. And eventually, as something of a holy nature, all these stories were invented later on.

Nilakantha

Śiva is designated as Nīlakaṇṭha, Nīlagrīva, Śitikaṇṭha, Śrīkaṇṭha, etc. The term for the first time occurs in the *Śatarudriya*.[6] The *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas relate various stories in regard to these designations of Śiva. The accounts may be summarized as follows : 'While the gods and the demons were busy with the act of churning the ocean, it is said that a draught of deadly poison came forth, and that on the request of the gods Mahādeva took and drank it, lest it should destroy. It is that bitter poison that turned his throat blue, whereupon he is known as Nīlakaṇṭha (blue-throat) ever after.'[7] The *Mahābhārata*

1. *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, 92 80.
2. Cf *Śiva P., Uttara, Śatarudriya Saṁ.*, Adh., 12, 36, ff.; *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 97–98.
3. *Kūrma, Pūrvabhāga*, Adh. 32.
4. Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XII, p. 443.
5. Cf. *Supra*.
6. *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, 16.7.
7. *Brahmāṇḍa, Pūrvabhāga*, Adh.25; *Vāyu P.*, Adh. 54.

gives a different account regarding Śrīkaṇṭha. It is as follows: 'When Śiva destroyed the sacrifice of Dakṣa, he thrust his flaring trident again and again at Dakṣa and the gods who had assembled there. The trident having done its work flew and fell with terrific force near the Āśrama of the Ṛṣis Nara and Nārāyaṇa at Badrī. The glow of the weapon was so great that the hair on the head of Nārāyana turned green like the Muñja grass. Nārāyaṇa thereupon repelled the trident, and it returned to its owner howling. Śaṅkara in anger ran up to Nārāyaṇa, who in turn seized him by his throat. Hence he is designated Śitikaṇṭha or Śrīkaṇṭha[1].

Some scholars have proposed that Rudra's blue neck (Nīlakaṇṭha or Śitikaṇṭha) like his other features are of a similar character, such as his blue tuft (*Av.* 2, 27. 6), braided hair (Kaparda, *Rv.* 1, 114. 1–5), and black belly and red back, must have been due to his identity with Agni.'[2] In our opinion this is far from correct. The *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* refers to the non-Aryan ascetics called Gārāgirs (cf. *Infra.* Part IV). As D. R. Bhandarkar has rightly observed, 'the expression meant 'swallowers of poison.' He further states, 'This naturally reminds us of one aspect of Śiva, namely, Nīlakaṇṭha, who became 'blue-throated,' because he swallowed the deadly poison called halāhala, which was churned out of the ocean. This is doubtless the Purāṇic way of explaining how Śiva became Nīlakaṇṭha. Originally, however, the god must have been credited with swallowing poison.'[3] However, the Ṛgvedic reference to the mad Muni who is said to have been drinking Viṣa alongside of Rudra, has nothing to do with the later notion of Nīlakaṇṭha. Because the expression Viṣa originally meant 'water' in the Ṛgvedic period.

As wearer of garland of skulls

Śiva is called as a wearer of the garland of skulls and a myth is attributed to him relating how he cut off the head of Brahmā with the end of the nail of his fingure, how he had to wander with the skull in hand on account of this sin committed by him against a Brahmin and how he had to practise penance. We have observed that the practice of offering human victims to Śiva was long in vogue since the proto-Indian period. This may be the reason why Śiva and Kālī are always represented as wearing the necklace of skulls. The Kāpālika and the Kāḷāmukha ascetics are called as the bearers of skulls.[4]

Siva and Ganga

Śiva is designated as Gaṅgādhara or 'bearer of Gaṅgā.' The story is related in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the various Purāṇas. Briefly narrated the story runs as follows: 'The descent of the heavenly Ganges into the earth was just to purify the ashes of the sinful sons of Bhagīratha, a later member of the same family. "The river of the God" consented to direct her course to the earth, but her force was such that the earth was unable to bear the shock. So Bhagīratha prayed to Śiva and the latter consented to receive the Ganges on his matted locks. The river, proud of her might, came down with all her force as if to crush Śiva, but found herself lost altogether in the tangled maze of Śiva's locks. Gaṅgā then became humble and Śiva let her flow forth again

1. *Mahābhārata* (cf. *Appendix*). Cf. *Harivaṁśa*, 3,31, 43 ff.
2. Venkataramanayya *Rudra-Śiva*, p. 18.
3. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 46.
4. Muir, *O.S.T.*, IV, 318.

from his locks in a tiny tickle. The river-goddess, the heavenly Ganges, is believed since then to abide in Śiva's matted hair as one of his consorts.'[1]

Venkataramanayya[2] has suggested that Śiva's connection with Gaṅgā was partly due perhaps to Iranian influences. He has adduced the following grounds in support of his argument. He says, 'Like Gaṅgā, Anahita was the personification of a heavenly river which had a counterpart on earth, probably the Oxus. Like the earthly Gaṅgā, the earthly Anahita had her origin in a mountain (Aburz—Hara berezaiti), and emptied its waters into the sea of Vourukassa. The close companionship which existed between Anahita and Mithra bears also striking resemblance to that of Gaṅgā and Śiva.' However, in our opinion, the above grounds are not sufficient to prove Venkataramanayya's hypothesis. Simply because there are some similarities between the origin of the two, e.g. Gaṅgā and Anahita, it does not follow that the notion of the former must have been borrowed from the Iranian regions. It may be just the other way also. We know that the proto-Indian God Śiva was closely associated with the Himālayas. And naturally, the idea of the holiness of Gaṅgā as a river situated in that mountain must have given rise to the legend current in Indian tradition. Moreover, the Iranians themselves are so much indebted to India that the source of many of the similarities between the cultural life of the Indians and Iranians may be found on the Indian soil itself.

His Three Eyes

We have already observed that Śiva was called as having three eyes during the proto-Indian period. The later designations of Śiva in this connection are Tryambaka, Trinetra, etc. Various myths in regard to the rising of the third eye are related during the Epic and Purāṇic period. In the *Mahābhārata* it is stated that, 'When Umā had shut the two eyes of Śiva (in a jocular fashion) the third eye of Śiva arose.'[3] The Purāṇas detail many other stories in this connection. Havell points out that, 'the *ūrṇā*, which in Buddhist images of metal, stone, or wood is often indicated by a pearl or jewel, is the symbol of the 'eye divine,' and afterwards developed into the third eye of Śiva.'[4] But there is nothing substantial on record to corroborate this view-point. The three eyes are identified with the Sun, Moon and Agni (Fire).

Siva and the Moon

Śiva is said to be the bearer of the crescent just above his third eye. The Purāṇas relate various stories regarding how Candra on account of the curse of Dakṣa approached Śiva, and how Śiva being pleased with his prayers gave him an abode on his forehead. It is also said that they worship Mahādeva in the Candra-dvīpa.[5] We have already stated above that the *crescent* on the forehead of Śiva is a mere development of the early representation of the so-called 'Triśūla horn' placed on the head of Śiva during the proto-Indian period.[6] (Cf. *Mohenjo Daro and Bactria*, Part I).

1. Cf. Part IV under *Purāṇic Saivism*.
2. Venkataramanayya, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
3. *Mahābhārata*, *Anuśasana P.*, Adh. 205.
4. Havell, *Ideals of Indian Art*, p. 51.
5. Cf. *Varāha*, Adh. 35; *Brahmavaivarta*, *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, 9, 58; cf. also *Bṛhaddharma*, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, Adh. 11; *Padma P. Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa*, Adh. 34, 108 ff.
6. *Kūrma P. Pūrvabhāga*, Adh. 47, p. 40.

Many of the epic and Purāṇic passages describe the close association of Śiva with the various tribes in ancient India. This may indicate that the various tribes in whose names Śiva is so designated might have been the keen worshippers of Śiva. Śiva is called by the following designations: Sārasvata,[1] Muṇḍa[2] (which may also mean a Sanyāsin), Bhārgava,[3] Daitya-nātha[4] (Lord of the Daityas), or the Lord of the federation of the Daityas and Dānavas[5] (Daitya-Dānava-saṅghānām patiḥ), Kurukartā,[6] Kaivarta, Kirāta, Mahāvyādha,[7] the Lord of the Kīlakas,[8] Kīkaṭa[9] (now Magadha), Lord of the Yakṣas (Yakṣeśvara),[10] Mīna, Mīnanātha (Fish or the Lord of the Fish),[11] Pañcāla and others.

Siva and Tribes

The above names evidently throw light on the early worshippers of Śiva. The Yakṣas, who took part in the Dāśarājña war against Sudās in the Ṛgvedic period, seem to have been originally non-Aryans. The Kirātas were also closely associated with Śiva. In fact Śiva is described as having fought in the guise of a Kirāta with Arjuna—a fact which indicates that the origin of the story can be traced to the ancient tradition, namely, that the Kirātas were keen devotees of Śiva. The Kirātas are mentioned in the *Atharvaveda*, and are described in the Purāṇas as performers of human sacrifice. It is worth noting that Śiva is also called the Lord of the Pañcālas.

The expression Paśupati is of free and common occurrence in the Epic and Purāṇic literature. It is used in the case of Pūṣan,[12] and later of Rudra in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, the *Atharvaveda* and later literature. We have already observed how Śiva must have been designated originally as Paśupati as he was supposed to be the lord of the various tribes who were represented by their lāñcchanas containing the figures of animals. But later on the term was misunderstood, and the term Paśupati came to mean the lord of animals as such.[13] Even the Devas are said to have become the Paśus of Śiva in Purāṇic tradition. The expressions Paśu, Pāśa came into vogue as Dravidian philosophical terminologies since the time of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.

Siva as Pasupati

As we shall observe in *Part V*, the various Purāṇic passages describe Śiva as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. However, during the period of the Epics and Purāṇas Śiva is mainly made to function in the capacity of the 'destroyer', whereas Brahmā and Viṣṇu are allotted the first and the second functions. Śiva is always described as

As creator, Preserver and Destroyer

1. Cf. *Brahmāṇḍa, Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 4, 60.
2. *Mbh. Āśvamedhika Parva*, 8, 16; *Śānti P.*, Adh. 350, 20.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Viṣṇudharmottara, Prathamakhaṇḍa, Adh.* 22, 23.
5. *Linga, Pūrvabhāga*, 21, 20.
6. *Mbh. Anuśāsana*, Adh. 48.
7. *Linga, Pūrvabhāga*, 96, 82.
8. *Skānda, Avanti-kṣetra Mā.*, 63, 124.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Vāmana P.* 47, 64.
11. *Skanda P., Māheśvarakhaṇḍa*, Adh. 17.
12. Eggeling, *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, III. 9, 1, 10; iii. 1, 4, 9; i. 7, 3, 8; *S.B.E.* Vols XXVI, pp. 219, 22; XII, p. 201.
13. Cf. *Supra*.

impersonating the dissolving and disintegrating powers and processes of Nature. Śiva is converted into a fierce universal destroyer (*sarva-bhūta-hara*), who annihilates at the end of every great age (*Kalpa*) not only men and all created things, but good and evil demons, and even Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and all the inferior gods. He is then called Rudra, Mahākāla, Hara, Anila (Fire), etc.' It is described in one of the legends that he wears the bones and skulls of the gods as ornaments and garlands. In another legend it is stated that, 'at the end of one of the early ages of the universe he burnt up the gods by a flash from his central eye, and afterwards rubbed their ashes upon his body.'[1] Even the fierce Tāṇḍava dance of Śiva, so often described in the Purāṇas and even in the proto-Indian inscriptions, depicts this capacity of Śiva since originally. In the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas Śiva is always described as 'a dweller in the burial places' (*Smaśāna–vāsin*). 'Cemeteries and burning grounds are his favourite haunts; imps and demons (Bhūtas and Piśācas) are his ready servants; and ferocity and irrascibility, on the slightest provocation, constitute his normal condition of mind.[2]'

As Ardha-narisvara

The idea of Śiva as Ardhanārīśvara (*ammān*) was current amongst the proto-Indians. The Purāṇas, however, have invented many a myth to explain why Śiva assumed this androgynous form. The story that is most often related mentions that, 'when Brahmā asked Rudra to divide himself, the latter divided himself into the male and the female forms. Another story relates that on one occasion Pārvatī said, 'let me reside with you all the while embracing you limb by limb.' Thus the form of Śiva became androgynous[3]'. The idea, however, was later on actually adopted in Kṛṣṇaism. It is said that Kṛṣṇa being anxious to enjoy the pleasures (*ramaṇotsuka*) became two-fold e.g. on the right Kṛṣṇa and on the left Rādhikā.[4]

Siva the Dancer

Śiva is often designated as Naṭa, Naṭarāja, etc. He is always depicted as 'a great master in the art of dancing. He was often dancing in ecstacy on the burning ground with great glee, accompanied by sweet music in which he was a great expert.[5] His fierce Tāṇḍava or the Mystic dance is always referred to in the Purāṇas. Gopinatha Rao says that, 'perhaps the one hundred and eight kinds of dances mentioned in the Śāstra are identical with the one hundred and eight modes of dances of Śiva.[6] The famous Naṭarāja temple at Cidambaram is very important in this connection.

As an Ascetic and Philosopher

Śiva is represented in a seated Yogic posture on some of the proto-Indian seals. Hence the idea of Śiva as an ascetic *par excellence* is current since the proto-Indian period. During the later period Śiva is designated as Yogī, Tapasvī (ascetic and self-mortifier), Mahāyogī, Mahātapaḥ, etc. Especially he is always depicted in the Purāṇas as nude (*nagna* or *digambara*), ash-besmeared, seated under a Bunyan tree in a Yogic posture rather in deep and profound meditation-absolutely passionless, motionless and

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 82.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Skānda* P., 47, 54 ff. (cf. *infra* under *Rudras*.)
4. *Brahmavaivarta P., Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, 48, 27, ff.
5. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II.i, p. 223.
6. *Ibid.*

immovable, sometimes seated with a canopy formed by a serpent's hood. The story of the disturbance caused by Kāma in his penance, and the latter's due destruction is very interesting.[1]

As a teacher of Yoga, music and other sciences he is known by the name of *Dakṣiṇāmūrti*, which fact is viewed in four different aspects, namely, as a teacher of *Yoga* of *Vīṇā*, of *Jñāna*, and also an expounder of other Śāstras (Vyākhyāna-mūrti). It is said that because Śiva was seated facing south when he taught the Ṛṣis Yoga and Jñāna he came to be known as Dakṣiṇāmūrti. The great Śaṅkara has composed a song in praise of this form of the deity. In all the Hindu temples, both Śiva and Vaiṣṇava, the niche on the south wall of the central shrine has the figure of Dakṣiṇāmūrti enshrined on it.[2] Śiva is said to have revealed the grammar to the greatest of Indian grammarians Pāṇini on account of which he is adored. In this capacity he is represented as a Brāhman wearing the Brahmanical thread, well-skilled in the Veda, and especially conversant with the Krama arrangement of the text. Further, a saying is current among the Paṇḍits: "No one, who is not Rudra, can repeat the *Krama* (*na Rudraḥ Kramapāṭhakaḥ*)". Some of his names also are indicative of this: Mantravid, Brahmavid, Brahmacārī, and Paṇḍita.

Siva and Kama

There is a close association between Śiva and Kāma, the God of Love. He is said to have been mainly responsible for bringing about the union of Śiva and Pārvatī (Satī in her former birth). When the whole trick became known to Śiva, the latter is said to have burnt with the fire in his eye. However, it is also pointed out, that when beseeched by Rati, Kāma's wife, Kāma became *anaṅga* (bodiless); and began to reside everywhere in Nature. The story occurs in many of the Purāṇas (cf. *Appendix*). The *Vāmana P.* narrates the story as follows:

"Nārada said, "for what reason was Kāma consumed by Śiva.?" Pulastya replied,—" When Satī, the daughter of Dakṣa, had departed to the abode of Yama, Kandarpa of the flowery bow observed Śaṅkara reflecting on the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice, and wounded him with the arrow of madness. Then Hara, maddened by the shaft of Kāma, began to traverse woods and rivers while his thoughts only fixed on Satī; nor, like a wounded elephant, could he obtain the least repose. Once Śaṅkara threw himself on the Kālindī river, but the waters were scorched and changed into blackness; and ever since its dark stream, though holy, flows through the forest like the string that binds a maiden's hair. Thus Śiva roamed over mountain and forest, grove and plain, hill and valley, rich in streams and lakes and all that affords delight, and yet could find no rest; and, ever as he thought on the lovely daughter of Dakṣa, he sometimes laughed and sometimes wept. Even when sleep did for a moment seal his eyes, he saw in his slumbers his beloved Satī, and would thus address her: 'O pitiless? stay: Why dost thou forsakest me who am blameless? For enamoured of thee, I am through thy absence consumed with the fire of love. O Satī! though thou went justly angry, yet bear not anger, O lovely one! To me, who prostrate myself at thy feet; and deign to speak to me, in whose thoughts thou art continually present.

1. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II, I. p. 273.
2. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

Fondly do I dwell on all thy former words of love ; and shouldst thou now render them untrue, and me desert, how can I survive ? Who does not pity him whom he beholds lamenting, and canst thou, O pitiless ! refrain from compassing thy lord. Come then, come thou, O lovely one ! and enfold me in thy embrace ; for otherwise, O my beloved ! the fire of love, with which I am consumed, can never be extinguished". Then the story describes how Śiva reduced Kāma to ashes with his world consuming eye. The poet-prince Kālidāsa details the scene in his famous *Kumārasambhava.* Kāma was restored to life again but as *anaṅga.* Though Kāma is not represented in art generally, still, there are the little representations of *Madanakai* or *Madana-gombi* in the Cennakeśava temple at Belūr. The *Atharvaveda* refers to Kāma.

Siva and Linga

Śiva stands fully indentified with the Liṅga during this period. The Liṅga cult attains also a unique position. The story of the Liṅgodbhavamūrti clearly proves the fact how a particular prominence is demanded for the cult even as compared to Brahmā and Viṣṇu. The Guḍimallam and the Bhīta icons rather represent the transitional stage of this idea. The idea came in full vogue during the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. (cf. for details under *The Liṅga*).

Eight forms

Śiva's name is included in the eight forms of Āditya (Sun) e.g. 'Āditya, Bhāskara, Bhānu, Ravi, Arka, Brahma, Rudra, and Viṣṇu.'[1] The eight forms of Śiva are described as consisting of the five elements, the Ātmā, the Sun, and the Moon.

Ganas of Siva

The various passages in the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas give detailed descriptions of the Gaṇas of Śiva. The *Skānda* narrates that Nandī, Bhṛṅgī, Mahākāla, Skandasvāmī, Gaṇapa, and others are the great Gaṇas (Mahāgaṇa).[2] The *Sauptika Parva* also throws light on the Bhūtagaṇas of Śiva.[3] The *Skānda* asserts that there are eleven crores of Gaṇas.[4] The *Skānda P.* gives a detailed list of these Gaṇas. We are quoting the text below.[5] The Gaṇas are sometimes spoken of as having the faces of different animals. Besides, Śiva is said to have been surrounded by *Bhūtas, Piśācas, Yakṣas, Gandharvas*, etc.

---

1. *Śiva P*, *Vāyavīya Saṁ.* 7, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 31, 1303.
2. *Skānda*, *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, *Dharmāraṇyakhaṇḍa*, 3,12 ff.
3. *Sauptika P.*, Adh. 7.
4. *Skānda*, *Prabhāsakh.* 4, 87, ff.
5. *Skānda*, *Kāśīkhaṇḍa*, Adh. 53:

नामग्राहं ततः पैशीद्रुमानपुरस्सरम् ।
शंकुकर्णमहाकालघंटाकर्णमहोदरः ॥ ५३।८ ॥
सोमनंदिनंदिषेण—कालपिंगल कुक्कुट ।
कुंडोदरमयूराक्षबाणगोकर्णतारक ॥ ९ ॥
तिलपर्णस्थूलकर्णद्रुमिचंडप्रभामय ।
सुकेशविंदिते छागे कपर्दिन्पिंगलाक्षक॥ १० ॥
वीरभद्रकिरातास्यचतुर्मुखनिकुंभक ।
पंचाक्षभारभूतात्यक्षपक्षक्षेमकलाशनिम् ॥ ११ ॥
विराधसुमुखाषाढे भवंतो मम सूनवः ।
यथेमौ स्कांदवैरेयौ नैगमेयौ यथा त्वयम् ॥ १२ ॥

Very often Śiva is said to have killed the following demons: Gajāsura, Kāla, Tripura, Jālandhara, Andhaka, Kāma (whom he burnt away to ashes), and others.

As destroyer of demons

Śiva is also known in his capacity of a bestower of boons and blessings. Viṣṇu is said to have obtained the Cakra from Śiva. He is described as having shown favour to Nandī, Gaṇapati, Candra (Moon), Mṛkaṇḍu, Paraśurāma, Kṛṣṇa, Rāvaṇa, and others.

Siva bestows favour

Śiva's Manifestations

Eleven Rudras

Various stories are related in regard to the birth of Rudra and the eleven Rudras. We have already pointed out that Śiva is represented with eleven armlets in the Indus Valley period. Eventually the number seems to have attained a sanctity of its own. The notion of the Viśvedevas contains a figure which is a multiple of eleven. The Mahābhārata describes that Rudra was the son of Tvaṣṭṛ, and details the names of the eleven Rudras: Ajaikapād, Ahirbudhnya, Virūpākṣa, Raivata, Hara, Bahurūpa, Tryambaka, Sureśvara, Sāvitra, Jayanta, Pinākī and Aparājita.[1] The Harivaṁśa[2] gives the genealogy of Śiva's family. It is pointed out that Anila's wife was Śivā, and that he had two sons Manojava and Avijñātagati. The text further proceeds:

Agni-putraḥ Kumārastu Śarastambe Śriyānvitaḥ ।
Tasya Śākho Viśākhas-ca Naigameyas-ca Pṛṣṭhajaḥ ॥ 42 ॥
Apatyam Kṛttikānām tu Kārttikeya iti smṛtaḥ ।
Skandaḥ Sanatkumāras-ca sṛṣṭaḥ pāden tejasaḥ ॥ 43 ॥

The *Brahmāṇḍa P.*[3] narrates that the eleven Rudras were born of Surabhi and Kaśyapa: Aṅgāraka, Sarpa, Nirṛti, Sadasaspati, Ajaikapād, Ahir-budhnya, Jvara, Bhuvana, Īśvara, Mṛtyu, and Kapāli. The *Bhāgavata P.*[4] attributes the birth of the crores of Rudras to Sarūpā, and gives the names of some: Raivata, Aja, Bhīma, Vāma, Ugra, Vṛṣākapi, Ajaikapād, Ahir-budhnya, Mahārūpa and Mahān. The *Padma P.* states that, Pitāmaha, mainly with the intention of creation, created the eleven Rudras, who were so called because they were weeping (rudanta) and sweating (dravanta). The eleven Rudras were Nirṛti, Saṅgha, Ayonija, Mṛgavyādha, Kapardī, Mahāviśveśvara, Ahirbudhnya, Kapāli, Piṅgala, Bhagavān and Senānī.[5] The *Matsya* gives two lists of the Rudras: (i) Ajaikapād, Ahirbudhnya, Virūpākṣa, Raivata, Hara, Tryambaka, Sureśvara, Sāvitra, Jayanta, Pinākī, and Aparājita;[6] (ii) the other list contains the following names: Nirṛti, Śambhu, Aparājita, Mṛgavyādha, Kapardī, Dahana, Khara, Ahirbudhnya, Bhagavān, Kapālī, Piṅgala, and Senānī.[7] The *Kūrma P.* states that when Rudra became enraged the Prāṇamaya-Rudra appeared through the mouth before him and wept; and when ordered, created beings

1. *Mbh. Śānti P.*, Adh. 207, 20.
2. *Harivaṁśa*, I, i, 41 ff.
3. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Madhyabhāga*, Adh. 3, 69 ff.
4. *Bhāgavata P.*, VI, 6, 17—18.
5. *Padma P., Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, 37, 83 ff.
6. *Matsya P.* 5, 29-30.
7. *Ibid.*, 171, 38 ff.

like himself.[1] The *Śiva P.*[2] states that the eleven Rudras were born of Surabhi and Kaśyapa. They were Kapālī, Piṅgala, Virūpākṣa, Vilohita, Śāstā, Ajaikapād, Ahirbudhnya, Śambhu, Caṇḍa, and Bhava. The *Saura P.* describes that the son of Brahmā was Fire, which is Rudrātmaka.[3] The *Vāmana P.* treats Śaṅkara as different from Rudra.[4] The *Padma P.*[5] gives an interesting version : how in the process of enragement of Brahmā the androgynous Rudra possessed of the midday sun-light, how on the order of Brahmā he divided himself into two, and how he divided himself into man and woman and out of the man into ten parts, thus making eleven men and one woman. The *Vanaparva*[6] observes that when Hari was enraged on account the action of Madhu and Kaiṭabha Śambhu was born from his forehead. The various Purāṇas give a detailed story of the *Rudra-sarga*. We are partly dealing with this problem under *Purāṇic Cosmogony* (Part IV). The *Padma P.*[7] states, that Pitāmaha told Bhava, Śarva, Īśāna, Śiva, Paśupati, Bhīma, Ugra, Mahādeva, that Sūrya, Jala, Mahī, Vanhi, Vāyu, Ākāśa, Dīkṣita Brāhmaṇa, and Soma shall be their bodies ; that their wives shall be Suvarcalā, Uṣā, Vikeśī, Śivā, Svāṅgadeśa, Dīkṣā and Rohiṇī ; and that their sons shall be Śanaiścara, Śukra, Lohitāṅga, Manojava, Svargāskanda, Santāna and Budha respectively. The *Viṣṇu P.*[8] gives the names of the sons: Śanaiscara, Śukra, Lohitāṅga, Manojava, Skānda, Svarga, Santāna and Budha. The *Brahmāṇḍa P.*[9] states that the Lord created through mind Rudra, Dharma, Mana, Ruci and Akṛti, and observes :

> *Ete mahābhujāḥ sarve prajānām sthiti-hetavaḥ* |
> *Oṣadhīḥ pratisaṁdhatte Rudraḥ Kṣiṇaḥ punaḥ punaḥ* || 2
> *Prāptoṣadhi-phalair-devaḥ samyagiṣṭaḥ phalārthibhiḥ* |
> *Tribhir-eva Kapālaistu Tryambakair-oṣadhīkṣayaḥ* || 3 ||

The *Mārkaṇḍeya* describes the process of creation in the Rudra-sarga and of the seven Rudras, their wives and their progeny.[10] The *Liṅga*[11] gives a Śaiva version. It is also worth noting that various stories are related how Bhauma and others were born in the different stages of the life of Śiva. Īśāna is also mentioned in the Purāṇas as forming one of the eight guardians of the universe. We are dealing with the whole problem in the *Appendix*.

However, many of the eleven names of Rudra have been handed down to us from ancient tradition. The expressions *Ajaikapād* and *Ahir-budhnya*[12] occur in the *Ṛgveda*. In our opinion, the expression *Ekapād* is indicative of the image standing on one leg in the Indus Valley period. The *Ekapād* posture is adopted as a process of penance. Śiva was a Yogin *par excellence*. And it is just possible that he was naturally described as *Ekapād*. The other expression *Ahir-budhnya* probably throws

1. *Kūrma. P., Pūrvabhāga*, Adh. 10.
2. *Śiva P. Uttara. Śatarudra-Saṁ*, 18, 24–25.
3. *Saura P.* 26, 26 ; cf. also *Kūrma, Pūrvabhāga*, 12, 14, which gives the names of 49 Vahnis (Fires).
4. *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 5.
5. *Padma P.* v, 3, 164 ff ; cf. also *Varāha*, 2, 46 ff.
6. *Mbh. Vanaparva*, 12, 40
7. *Padma*, v, 3, 164 ff.
8. *Viṣṇu P.*, I, 7, 11–12.
9. *Brahmāṇḍa, Pūrvabhāga*, III, 9, 1 ff.
10. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 52, 2ff.
11. *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, 5, 27ff; 41, 25ff.
12. Cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 73-74; *ṚV.* X, 65, 13, 66. 11; *AV.* IV, 1. 6; *Pāraskara GS.*, 2, 15.2.

light on the close association of Śiva and the Nāga, which was supposed to be in the depths of the world, or the later Pātāla.

Vīrabhadra

Vīrabhadra is said to have been born from one of the matted hair of Śiva when he had become enraged at the time of Dakṣa's sacrifice. Sometimes he is also supposed to be one of the forms of Śiva.[1] Vīrabhadra is a favourite deity of the Kurumbas, a tribe of hunters and shepherds in Southern India.[2]

Bhairava

Bhairava is another fierce form of Śiva. The eight Bhairavas are enumerated as follows: Asitāṅga, Ruru, Bhīṣaṇa, Raktanētraka, Baṭuka, Kāladamana, Dantura, and Vikaṭa. There are again given eight names under each of the eight above, thus making the number sixty-four. Bhairava or Bhairom is worshipped by the *Kānphāṭā yogīs*, and is a popular god in the whole of India.

Asta-dikpalas.

Śiva also finds a place in the list of the eight guardians of the universe. It is said, 'that Indra was posted to the east, while Agni was to the south-east, Yama to the south, Nirṛti to the south-west, Varuṇa to the west, Vāyu or Marut to the north-west, Kubera to the north, and Īśāna or Śiva to the north-east.'

Siva and the Vedas

The *Viṣṇudharmottara P.* states that *Ṛgveda* is known as (belongs to) Brahmā, Yajurveda as Vāsava, Sāmaveda as Viṣṇu, and Śambhu as Atharvaṇa.[3] It is further said that the four forms of Śiva in the four Yugas are Yogī in Kṛtayuga, Kratu in Treta, Kālāgni in Dvāpara, and Dharmaketu in Kaliyuga.[4] The other manifestations of Śiva may be described as: Sadāśiva with five faces, the Vidyeśvaras, the Maheśamūrti, the Pañca-Brahmas (i.e. Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Vāmadeva and Sadyojāta), Kṣetrapāla, etc. The *Śiva Purāṇa* also enumerates the names of the ten Avatāras of Śiva: Mahākāla, Tāra, Bhuvaneśa, Śrīvidyeśa, Bhairava, Cchinnamastaka, Dhūmavān, Bagaḷāmukha, Mātaṅga, and Kamala or Kāmala.[5]

Siva in Art

Besides the representations of Śiva in various forms, the artists of ancient India have depicted the different phases in the life of Śiva, and they have given rise to the following: the Ugra forms—Kāmāntaka-mūrti, Gajāsura-saṁhāra, Kālāri, Tripurāntaka, Śarabheśa, Brahmaśirscchedana, Bhairava (the sixty-four Bhairavas), Vīrabhadra, Jālandhara-hara, Mallāri-Śiva-Andhakāsuravadha, Aghora-Mahākāla; the Anugraha-mūrtis—Caṇḍeśānugraha, Viṣṇvanugraha, Nandīśānugraha, Vighneśānugraha, Kirātārjuna, Rāvaṇānugraha; and the Nṛttamūrtis: Dakṣiṇāmūrti, Kaṅkāla, Bhikṣāṭaṇa, Gaṅgādhara, Ardhanārīśa, Śiva, Haryardha, Kalyāṇasundara, Vṛṣavāhana, Viṣapariharaṇa, and other images.

Conclusion

Thus the Epic and the Purāṇic period has placed before us the Vrātya pantheon in its full-fledged form. The Bhāraśivas, the Vākāṭakas, the Guptas, and the early Cālukyas gave an impetus to Hindu religion, so much so, that we find that the artists made themselves busy in depicting the various scenes in Hindu mythology. The caves at Elephanta and the Bādāmi seem to show this stage of transition.

---

1. *Bṛhad-dharma P.*, Adh. 38, 42.
2. Hewitt, '*Ruling Races etc.*' I, p. 136.
3. *Viṣṇudharmottara P.*, III, Adh. 73, 43.
4. *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, 31,6.
5. *Siva P. Śata-Rudra-Saṁ.*, 3, Adh. 16.

CHAPTER V

THE LINGA

Introductory—Mohenjo Daro Period—Early references—Native account—some aspects—Liṅga and Yoni—Story of Liṅgodbhava—Liṅga and Serpent—Important places—Liṅga and burial ground—Kinds of Lingas—Varieties in art.

Mainly on account of its close association with Śiva, the phallic cult has assumed a significant role in the religious history of India. The Liṅga worship has been of wide prevalence in the ancient world. We find the traces of it in India, ancient Egypt, Syria, Babylon, among the Assyrians, in Persia, Greece, Italy, Spain, Germany, Scandinavia, among the Gauls, and in different parts of Armenia, Mexico, Peru, and Hayti.

In India itself the Mohenjo Daro discoveries have thrown a flood of light on the early prevalence of the cult of the Liṅga and Yoni.

Diverse opinions have been expressed in regard to the origin and antiquity of the Liṅga cult. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar expresses the view-point that, 'Liṅga worship had, it appears, not come into use at the time of Patañjali for the instance he gives under V, 3.99 is that of an image or likeness (Prakṛti) of Śiva as an object of worship and not of any emblem of that God. It seems to have been unknown even in the time of Wema Kadphises, for, on the reverse of the coins...there is no Liṅga or a phallus.'[1] Creuzer represented it as, next to that of the Trinity, the ancient religious form of India.[2] Stevenson is of opinion that it was originally prevalent amongst the Dravidians alone. Some scholars point out that the cult must have first originated in the western nations and even among the Greeks.[3]

But the curt manner in which the Ṛgvedic bards refer to the phallic god (*Śiśna-devāḥ*—from the Dravidian word *Śunni*) clearly proves the non-Aryan nature of the phallic cult. The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions also corroborate this view-point.

The Liṅga in the Mohenjo Daro period

Both the Archæological data and the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions point out the unique phase in the history of the phallic cult in ancient India. It is proposed to deal here with the main results below.

Archæological Data

Sir John Marshall distinguishes three types of cult-stones at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, namely, the bætylic, the phallic, and the *yoni* ring-stones. To say in the words of Marshall :[4]

"The first class comprises those of the type illustrated in Plates XII, 3, and IV, 2, 4 and 5. Two of these (Pl. XIV, 2 and 4) are unquestionably phallic, more or less realistically modelled, and for all of the fantastic theory that it was introduced into India by the Greeks or other western invaders. Further evidence on the same point is furnished by two realistic specimens of the same kind, one a *liṅga* or phallus

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism, and other minor religious Systems*, p. 115.
2. Creuzer, *Symbolik*, t i. p. 575, 2nd Ed.
3. Cf. F. Kittel, *Über den Urspring des Linga Kultus in India*, p. 46.
4. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, I, pp. 59 ff.

(Pl. XIII), and the other a *yonī* or vulva (Pl. XIII, 7), which Sir Aurel Stein found on the Chalcolithic sites in Northern Baluchistan, the former at Mughal Ghuṇḍāi, the latter at Periāno Ghuṇḍāi. The other objects are rather conventionalised in shape.

"Indeed, the only explanation applicable to these all is that they were sacred objects of some sort, the larger ones serving as aniconic agalmata for cult purposes, the smaller as amulets to be carried on the person, just as miniature *liṅgas* are commonly carried by Śaivas to-day.

"The stones of the second class are like many of the *liṅgas* seen in Śiva temples to-day. They equally resemble the bætylic stones which have recently been unearthed in the temple of Mekal at Beison[1]...The only reason, therefore, for interpreting Mohenjo Daro examples as a phallic rather than bætylic is that their conical shape is now commonly associated with that of the liṅga.

"This third class of these stone objects comprises ring-stones of the types illustrated in Pls. XIII, 9–12, and XIV, 6 and 8 in large numbers at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa. An explanation of these ring-stones that has been suggested to me by Mr. Henry Cousens is that they were threaded on poles to form columns, but this suggestion leaves out of account the smaller specimens, some of which are no bigger than finger rings and obviously could not have served as architectural members...Nor can they be similar to the stone wheel-money in use on the island of Uap in the Carolines.

Finally, he concludes, "Whether these three types represent three distinct cults is uncertain; but it is not unnatural to suppose that *liṅga* and *yonī* worship may have been associated then, as they were later under the *ægis* of Śaivism. On the other hand, it is probable that they were originally quite distinct from bætylic worship, which is found frequently connected with the cult of the Mother Goddess among the oldest tribes, whereas phallism is rarely, if ever, found among these aboriginal people."

Inscriptional evidence

Besides the archæological evidence, the inscriptions of the period also supply us with an interesting data. We are here summarizing the main results arrived at by Father Heras. 'The inscriptions relate that the early worshippers of the *liṅga* were the Kāvals and the Bilavas. The Bilavas evidently were the Bhils and the Kāvals the same as the robber caste of the North and the South.[2] They were probably Kolerian in origin and they brought this cult from far-off Eastern Islands.[3] Their symbol consisted of the liṅga.[4] That the liṅga cult was originally in vogue among the Kāvals and the Bilavas is proved by the following inscriptions :

(1) "In the dark growing half of the moon, when the sun was on high, the Bilavas pulled down the four houses of the Liṅga."[5] According to this inscription the Liṅga among the Bilavas had houses the rent of which was used for fostering the cult.[6]

1. *Daily Telegraph*, 13th April, 1929.
2. Heras, 'Religion of the Mohenjo-Daro People acc. to Ins,' *J. U. B.*, V. I. p. 16.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Cf. Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the People and the Land,' *Indian Culture*, Vol. III, No. 4.
5. Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 406.
6. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

(2) "The Liṅga of the eight villages of the Velvel Bilavas (is) the high sun of the harvest." [1]

(3) "The old Liṅga of the Kāvals." [2]

Its early introduction

The inscriptions indicate, in the opinion of Father Heras, that the cult was first introduced in the Mohenjo Daro region by the Mīna king. One of the inscriptions relates, "the imprisoned illustrious ruler of the Liṅga."[3] However, another inscription designates him as 'Śunni Mīna.' [4] Probably on account of this that the king seems to have been deposed and imprisoned by a popular rising. An inscription says, "(the object of) the hostility of the Mīnas is the imprisoned illustrious ruler, (who is) a priest." [5] The other inscriptions describe "the end of the power of Mīna,"[6] and also "of the death of Mīna." [7] Further on, an inscription carved after his death seems to commemorate the bitter feeling of the Mīnas towards their old king in a sarcastic way: "The tree of the canalized united countries of the Kāvals of (dedicated to) all the gods, whom Mīna who was in the house has reached."[8]

Linga and the Sun

Some of the inscriptions relate how the Liṅga was identified with the Sun who stood identified with Śiva originally, e.g. (1) "The Liṅga of the eight villages of Velvel Bilavas (is) the high sun of the harvest;"[9] and (2) "The lustrous Liṅga of the high sun."[10]

The cult seems to have been connected with a house divided on account of the rites of the two suns.'[11] According to one of the inscriptions, "those (are) the high suns."[12] As Father Heras observes: "At the present state of our knowledge, it is impossible to say how this sect originated, but it seems to have been the cause of division of a house or family, as the inscription avers. Perhaps this expression refers to an event similar to the revolution caused in Mīnāḍ by the introduction of the cult of the Liṅga."[13]

The Linga and Siva

Consequently, in the opinion of Father Heras, it was during this period alone that the Liṅga was identified with Śiva. Śiva was supposed to be the creator of the world. And when once the Liṅga was given the sublime position by its identification with the Sun it was but natural that it should be identified with Śiva also. One of the inscriptions relates: "The moon (is) over the white mountain of Velan of the *Liṅga* of the divided house of the two high suns."[14] The white mountain referred to in the inscription is the Kailāsa mountain. And Velan is the name of Subrahmanya or Mūrugan. Evidently,

1. Marshall. *Harappa*, No. 99.
2. *Ibid., H.*, No. 118.
3. *Ibid., M. D.*, No. 132.
4. *Ibid., M.D.*, No. 40.
5. *Illustrated London News*, 4-10-24.
6. Marshall, *H.* No. 153.
7. *Ibid, H.*, No. 127.
8. Marshall, *M.D.*, No, 11.
9. Marshall, *H.*, No. 99.
10. Marshall, *H.*, No. 45; Cf. *Ibid, M.D.*, Pl. XVI, No. 337; *Ibid, H*, No. 99, etc.
11. Heras, 'The Velāḷas in Mohenjo Daro,' *Indian Culture*, No. 4, p. 54.
12. *A. S. I. Report*, 1929-30, Pl. XXVIII, No. 11466 (4). Cf. Marshall, *op. cit.*, *M.D.* No. 490.
13. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
14. Photo, *M.D.*, 1933-31, Dk. 10551.

the *Linga* must stand for Śiva. Because, to whom did the Kailāsa mountain belong ?"[1]

Early References

Side by side with the Mohenjo Daro period, the earliest reference made to the Liṅga cult is in the *Ṛgveda*. The Vedic bards prayed that, 'let not the *Śiśnadevāḥ* enter their sacrificial pandal.' To quote the exact stanza itself :

" Na yātavaḥ Indra Jūjuvaḥ naḥ na
Vandanā viśiṣṭatvētyābhiḥ,
Sa-śardhan Aryaḥ viṣuṇajya Jantoḥ mā
Śiśna-devāḥ asiguḥ ṛtam naḥ."[2]

The expression occurs once again in the *Ṛgveda*.[3]

But what should be the meaning of the expression ? Almost all the scholars, up till now, interpreted the word as meaning '(those) who (have the) Phallus as their deity.'[4] But under the present circumstances, especially in the light of the new evidence that has become available in Sumer (Khafaje) and Mohenjo Daro, we may definitely say that the above interpretation is wrong, and that the expression *Śiśna-devāḥ* must mean those (Gods) possessed of a *Śiśna* (*Śiśna-Yuktāḥ-Devāḥ*), which is rather a curt manner of abusing the Gods of the indigenous people of India, whose Śiva was perfectly nude. The standing figures of Śiva are to be found in Khafaje (Sumer) also. That is an instance how the God of the Mohenjo Daro had later travelled there. This kind of interpretation is also in keeping with the learned scholarship of the Vedic singers. If they really wanted to refer to the Śiśna-worshippers, then we may say, that vocabulary was not wanting for them so as to use the expression in such a roundabout fashion—as the later critics and commentators want them to do. Further this also agrees with the version how the Rudra, who was not allowed to have any share in the scarifice, was later on offered the share in the oblations. The story of Dakṣa and Śiva also shows how mythology developed itself later on. That the word Rudra conveyed the meaning of a standing figure of Śiva in an *Ūrdhva-liṅga* posture is directly conveyed by many of the Purāṇic passages, which have tried to give the meaning of the word Sthāṇu. The word Sthāṇu occurs once in the *Ṛgveda* but in a different sense. But the expression as indicating Śiva is of free and common occurrence in the Purāṇic period.[5]

The *Atharvaveda* describes the Skambha (pillar) as co-extensive with the universe and comprehends in him the various parts of the material universe, as also the abstract qualities, such as Tapas, faith, truth, and divisions of time. It is further stated that, "He is distinct from Prajāpati, who founds the universe upon him. The thirty-three gods are comprehended in him and arose out of non-entity, which forms his highest member, as well as entity which is embraced within him. The gods who

1. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
2. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 21.5.
3. *Ibid*, X, 99.3.
4. Cf. *Vedic Index* : Sāyaṇa interprets the word as meaning '*abrahma-cāriṇaḥ*'.
5. A. P. Karmarkar, 'Fresh and Further Light on the Mohenjo Riddle', *A. B. O. R. I.*, XXI, pp. 122–23.

form part of him do homage to him. Where Skambha brought Purāṇa-Puruṣa (the primeval Being) into existence, and Skambha in the beginning shed forth that gold (Hiraṇya, out of which Hiraṇya-garbha arose) in the midst of the world. He who knows the golden reed standing in the waters is the mysterious Prajāpati." [1] It is interesting to note that the word *Velas*, which is used for the reed, has the sense of *membrum virile*, both in the *Ṛgveda* [2] and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. Gopinatha Rao makes a significant observation in this connection: 'It is this same Skambha that has given birth to the Purāṇic story of Śiva's appearance as a blazing pillar between Brahmā and Viṣṇu, when they were quarrelling about the superiority of the one over the other.'[3] However, in our opinion, even this idea seems to be of pre-Vedic origin.

It is also pointed out that there are many more phallic ideas and rites depicted in the *Yajurveda* [4] e.g. in the *Mahāvrata* at the winter solstice, in the horse sacrifice, and even in the Soma sacrifice. However, they are not really phallic rites but may be styled as obscene only; and they very likely reveal some early fertility magic of the primitive Aryans. [5] The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* describes Rudra as the Lord of Yonis, [6] thus indicating the close association of Rudra-Śiva with the cult of Yoni. The *Mahābhārata* has supplied us with some interesting details regarding the *Liṅga* cult. In the *Droṇa-Parva* it is said that Sthāṇu is so called because the Liṅga is always standing (erect). [7] Further the expressions Ūrdhvaliṅga [8], Ūrdhva-retas [9] and Sthira-liṅga[10] as applied to Śiva occur in the different portions of the *Mahābhārata*. Best of all, we find that Śiva is designated as *Mahāśepho Nagno* thus referring to his nude posture.[11] The *Anuśāsana* generally depicts the importance of the worship of the Liṅga.[12] The *Harivaṁśa* emphatically identifies the Liṅga and the Bhagaliṅga with Tryambaka (Śiva) and Umā, and states, that there is no third entity as apart from these in the world.[13] Both the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas have given fantastic accounts regarding the close identification of the Liṅga and Śiva. We are dealing with the problem below.

Native Accounts of the Origin of Liṅga

The Purāṇas and the Epics have preserved many traditional accounts regarding the origin of the Liṅga cult. These accounts are mainly mythical and fabulous. Before narrating a few of these stories, we shall just summarize the details wherein they actually vary. The *Skānda P.* narrates that when Śiva went for begging alms in a naked fashion to Dāruvana all the wives of the Ṛṣis fell in love with him, and that the

1. *Atharvaveda*, X, 8.
2. *Ṛgveda*, X, 95,4-5.
3. Gopinatha Rao, *E.H.I.*, II.i.p. 571.
4. *Cf. Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, 23, 19; *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 13, 2, 8, 5; *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, 3, 12, 20.
5. Heras, 'Were the Mohenjo Darians Aryans?', *Journal of Indian History*, XX, p. 29.
6. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, 4. 11. 5-2.
7. *Mahābhārata, Droṇa P.*, pp. 203, 133.
8. *Śānti P.*, Adh. 46, 266.
9. *Anuśāsana P.*, 4, 212; 17, 41.
10. *Ibid.*, 161. 11.
11. *Ibid.*, 14. 15.
12. *Ibid.*, Adh. 45, 214 ff.
13. *Harivaṁśa*, II, 72,60.

Ṛṣis cursed him eventually that his Liṅga would fall down. [1] The *Saura Purāṇa* thoroughly corroborates the above account.[2] The *Liṅga P.* states that Śiva wanted to know and examine the philosophical knowledge attained by the Ṛṣis residing at Dāruvana, and it was afterwards that the above facts happened. [3] But the *Padma P.* gives a different story altogether: 'On the event of the second marriage of Brahmā with Gāyatrī, however, Sāvitrī cursed also Śiva (because he had attended the ceremony), saying that the Ṛṣis would curse him, and that eventually his Liṅga would fall down. But later on, when appeased, she said that the Liṅga thus fallen down shall be worshipped by mankind.' [4] The *Vāmana* P., on the other hand, relates that when Brāhmā retired, Śiva installed the Liṅga (in the subtle form) in the Citravana forest, and began to wander. [5] The *Mahābhārata* relates a very funny story how Śiva forcibly thrust the Liṅga in the ground, and how it stood erect. We shall now quote some of the passages.

Origin of the Liṅga

The *Vāmana Purāṇa* [6] *narrates the story as follows*: It is, however, said Śiva being grieved at the loss of Satī began to wander. The story proceeds: "Then Hara, wounded by the arrows of Kāma, wandered into a deep forest, named Dāruvana, where holy sages and their wives resided. The sages on beholding Śiva saluted him with bended heads, and he, wearied, said to them, 'Give me alms.' Thus he went begging round the different hermitages; and wherever he came, the minds of the sages' wives, on seeing him, became disturbed and agitated with the pain of love, and all commenced to follow him. But when the sages saw their holy dwellings thus deserted, they exclaimed, "May the *liṅga* of this man fall to the ground." That instant the Liṅga of Śiva fell to the ground; and the God immediately disappeared. The Liṅga, then, as it fell, penetrated through the lower worlds, and increased in height, until its top towered above the heavens; the earth quaked, and all things movable and immovable were agitated. On perceiving which Brahmā hastened to the sea of milk, and said to Viṣṇu, 'Say, why does the universe thus tremble?' Hari replied, 'On account of the falling of Śiva's *liṅga*, in consequence of the curse of the holy and divine sages.' On hearing of this most wonderful event, Brahmā said, 'Let us go and behold this *Liṅga*.' The two Gods then repaired to Dāruvana, and on beholding it without beginning or end, Viṣṇu mounted the king of birds (Garuḍa) and descended into the lower regions in order to ascertain its base; and for the purpose of discovering its top, Brahmā in a lotus car ascended the heavens; but they returned from their search wearied and disappointed, and together approaching the liṅga, with due reverence and praises, entreated Śiva to resume his *liṅga*. Thus propitiated that God appeared in his own form and said: 'If gods and men will worship my Liṅga, I will resume it, but not otherwise; and Brahmā divided its worshippers into four sects, the principal one of those, that which simply worships Śiva under the symbol of the Liṅgam; the second that of Paśupati; the third of Mahākāla; and the

1. *Skānda Purāṇa, Nāgarakhaṇḍa,* 1, 22 ff., also VII, i, Adh. 187. 28; also VI *Nagarakhaṇḍa*, Adh.258.
2. *Saura Purāṇa*, 69, 53.
3. *Liṅga P., Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 29.
4. *Padma Purāṇa*, 5 *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa*, 17.
5. *Vāmana Purāṇa*, Adh. 6, 93.
6. Cf. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 298 ff.

fourth, the Kapila; and revealed from his own mouth the ordinances by which this worship was to be regulated. Brahmā and the Gods then departed, and Śiva resumed the Liṅga."

The *Mahābhārata* gives an interesting account in connection with the origin of the Liṅga. Kṛṣṇa is described to have related to Yudhiṣṭhira: "Brahmadeva once told Śaṅkara not to create. Whereupon Śaṅkara concealed himself under water for a long time. When therefore, there was no creation for such a long period, Brahmadeva created another Prajāpati, who brought into existence a large number of beings. These beings, being afflicted with hunger, went to Prajāpati to devour him. He, being afraid, went to Hiraṇyagarbha, who created two kinds of food for those beings and then they were quieted. After some time Mahādeva rose out of the water, and seeing that new beings had been created and were in a flourishing condition, he cut off his organ of generation as no more necessary, and it stuck into the ground. He then went away to perform austerities at the foot of the Mūjavant Mountain." [1]

The *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa* gives an altogether different description of the version. It relates, "The eighth Kalpa is known as the Liṅga-Kalpa. Dharma was the Supreme Being. From Dharma was born desire (Kāma), and from Kāma (or on account of Kāma) the Liṅga divided itself threefold i. e. Pulliṅga (Male), Strīliṅga (Female), and Klība-liṅga (Neutral). From the Pulliṅga was born Viṣṇu, from Strīliṅga was born Indirā, and from the third Śeṣa (Serpent). Later on proceeds the story of the creation of the world through Brahmā, etc." [2]

Some Aspects of the Liṅga Cult

During the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇic period we find that almost all the functionings of Śiva were attributed to the Liṅga. Besides, the cult of the Liṅga had assumed diffierent forms according to the nature of worshippers.

The Linga and Yoni

We have already observed that the cult of the Liṅga and Yoni as symbolising the generative and reproductive aspects of nature had come into vogue during the proto-Indian period. Moreover, both these elements were identified with the Supreme Being Śiva and Ammā, the Mother Goddess. These aspects are represented in the Purāṇas and in Indian art also. The Purāṇas specifically state that all that is Pulliṅga (male sign) is Śiva, and all that is *Bhaga-liṅga* (female sign) is Pārvatī.

Marshall has referred to several other curious stone discs, three of which were unearthed from the Bhir Mound at Taxila belonging to the Mauryan period, one from inside the structure uncovered near the foot of Hathial (Taxila) and one at Kosam. A fragment of a similar object was recently found in course of excavation at Rajghat near Benares. Marshall describes that the Hathial disc is of a polished sandstone 3¼" in diameter adorned on the upper surface with concentric bands of cross and cable patterns and with four nude figures alternating with honey-suckle

1. Quoted by R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism*, etc. (Collected works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol.) IV, p.61.
2. *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, 3, 4, 25. Vs. 124 ff.

designs engraved in relief around the central hole.[1] Recently Banerjea has described another instance. It is a partially broken reddish steatite circular disc about 2¼" in diameter, found at Rajghat, which contains on the outer side of its top surface a very well-carved decorative design. The decoration consists of a palm-tree with a horse by its side, beyond which is a female figure holding a bird in her outstretched right hand, then follow in successive orders a long and short-tailed animal, a crane, the goddess again with her hands this time stretched downwards, some object which is broken, a palm-tree again, a bird, a circular disc, the goddess again with the circular disc near her left shoulders, then a winged mythical animal and lastly a crane with a crab-like object near its legs.[2]

Marshall observes, that 'All things considered, however, a more reasonable and adequate explanation of these ring-stones is to be found in the magical properties which they possess and in the universal awe in which they are held in India, whether as fetishes or as actually imbued with a divine spirit.'[3] Crooke gives some illustrations in this connection. 'There is the Śrigundi stone at Malabar Point, near Bombay, which is supposed to purify those, who crawl through it, of sin or sickness. It was through this stone that Śivājī crept to purge himself of the murder of Afzal Khan, and others of the Marāṭhā Peshwas followed his example. Again, at Śatruñjaya, the hole in it being known as Muktadvāra (door of absolution), through which anyone who can creep is assured of happiness. These and other stones of the same class are definitely regarded as Yonis or female symbols of generation, the idea being that those who pass through them are, as it were, born again, while in the case of the smaller stones of the same form, the mere passing of the hand or fingure through them is an act of special virtue or significance.'[4]

Instances may be added. Banerjea points out that all the above discs can justifiably be regarded as cult objects comparable with the prehistoric ring-stones on the one hand, and the Cakras and the Yantras of the Śāktas, the Viṣṇupaṭṭas of the Vaiṣṇavas and the Āyāpaṭṭas of the Jains on the other.[5]

The joint representation of the Liṅga and the Yoni can be very easily perceived in the case of all the installations of the Liṅga e.g. 'there is a spout-like projection from which the Pūjābhāga of the Śiva-Liṅga rises upwards, and which serves the purpose of *nālā* or drain for the easy outflow of water usually poured on the top of the emblem by the worshippers.'

Story of Lingodbhava

We have already detailed the account of Liṅgodbhava of Śiva, when actually a quarrel for supremacy had arisen between Viṣṇu and Brahmā. This story is clearly invented for showing and enhancing the importance of Śiva, and much more so, that of the Liṅga. The story of the Liṅgodbhava is also described in the legends of Mārkaṇḍeya, who was saved by Śiva from the clutches of Yama, and that of Kaṇṇappā. The former is of free and common occurrence in the Purāṇas. The latter may be briefly narrated as follows. 'The hunter Tiṇṇen, while chasing a wild boar on a day, reached the banks of the river *Ponna Mogaliar*. A small Śiva temple had been built near the spot. Tiṇṇen,

1. *A. S. I. R.*, 1927-28, p. 66.
2. Banerjea, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
3. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 62.
4. Crooke, *op. cit.*, p. 322 ff.
5. Banerjea, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

with another hunter Kadden, visited this shrine. Living always in the forest, he knew nothing of religious matters, but his friend Kadden explained to him that the god-head was incarnate in the Liṅgam. Tiṇṇen felt within himself a burning devotion. Daily thereafter he offered the god water, flowers, and even meat, since he knew not the rules of the cult. One day he saw the drops of blood flowing from the eye of the god. Young Tiṇṇen thinking that wicked persons had broken it, tore out one of his own eyes to replace the one which Śiva had lost. Next day Tinnen saw drops of blood flowing from the other eye, so he wanted to cut out his only remaining one, with a knife. Both his hands were required for this operation, for, after losing his eye-sight he would not be able to find the eye-socket on the Liṅga in order to put his eye into it. He therefore put his sandalled foot on the spot and was just going to insert the knife into his own eye when Śiva coming out of the Liṅga, stayed his arm.'[1]

The Linga and Serpent

In accordance with the system of polarization prevalent amongst the Vrātyas the idea of destruction and fertility were brought together in the case of the Liṅga also. A snake is often found enclosing the Liṅga in Hindu mythology. In some southern temples, two erect serpents have their heads together above the Liṅga, or they may appear on either side of it as if in an attitude of worship. Monier Williams observes that he had seen images of serpents coiled round the symbol of the male organ of generation. In some cases five-headed snakes formed a canopy over the Liṅga. [2] In the temple of Viśveśvara in Benares, there is a coil of a serpent carved round one or two of the most conspicuous symbols of male generative energy. [3] It is also worth noting that the Phœnicians entwine the folds of a serpent around the cosmic egg. [4]

Early Devotees

The Purāṇas have given details regarding the early devotees of the Liṅga e.g. The Traipuras,[5] Mahiṣāsura,[6] Rāma (Dāśarathi),[7] Bāṇa,[8] Śākalya (a Rājarṣi), [9] Vasumata,[10] Kṛṣṇa,[11] Sudhvamukha, [12] Kārttavīrya,[13] Vīraketu,[14] Rāvaṇa and others.

Important places

The most important places of Liṅga worship are : Kedāreśvara-liṅga on the Himālaya, the Vaidyanātha at Deogarh (or Paraḷi), the Viśvēśvara-liṅga in Benares, the Mahākāla-liṅga, Āmrēśvara-liṅga in and near Ujjain in Mālava, the Oṁkāra-liṅga on the Narmadā, the Somēśvara-liṅga, Somanāth in Surāṣṭra, the Tryambaka-liṅga near Nāśik, the Bhīmāśaṅkara-liṅga near the source of the Bhīmā in Mahārāṣṭra, the Mahābalēśvara-liṅga at Gokarṇa in Kanara, the Mallikārjuna-liṅga at Śri-Śaila in Karnul, the Rāma-liṅga at Rāmēśvaram. The location of Gautameśa-liṅga, Nāgeśa (Dārukāvana) is not

1. G. Jouveau—Dubreuil, *Iconography of South India*, p. 16.
2. Murray, *Religious Thought and Life in India*, p, 327.
3. *Ibid*, p. 439.
4. Scott, *Phallic Worship*, p. 82.
5. *Skānda P, Aruṇācala Mā.*, 10. 57.
6. *Ibid, Uttarārdha*, Adh. 19.
7. Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*—Rāma installs the Liṅga at Rāmēśvaram.
8. *Matsya P.*, 187. 8.
9. *Skānda P, Prabhāsa-kṣetra Mā.*, 74, 2.
10. *Skānda P., Prabhāsa-khaṇḍa*, 11, 21.
11. *Mbh. Droṇa P.*, Adh. 202, 101.
12. *Skānda P., Prabhāsa-kṣetra Mā.*, 15. 16.
13. *Ibid, Avanti-khaṇḍa*, 11, 23.
14. *Ibid*, 5,2,73.40.

known. It is said, that 'the South of India has five holy liṅgas representing the five elements of earth, water, fire, wind, and air (*ākāśa*) respectively, at Kāñci or Conjeeveram Jambhūkeśvaram or Tiruvanaikaval between Trichinopoly and Śrīrangam, Tiruvannamalai or Aruṇācala, Kālahasti, and Cidambaram'. [1] The Liṅga at Tiruvarur in Tanjore also claims to be the Ākāśaliṅga. The *Skānda P.* gives an interesting information regarding the Kumārēśvara-liṅga at Khambāyat (Stambha-tīrtha). [2]

The Linga on burial ground

Crooke has made some interesting observations in this connection: The old ritual directs that all who return from a funeral must touch the Liṅgam, fire, cow-dung, a grain of barley, a grain of sesame and water, "all," as Prof. Gubernetis says, "symbols of that fecundity which after the contact with a corpse might have destroyed." [3]

The Liṅga as a symbol of fertility is installed on the Samādhi of saints, and it is also regularly worshipped. To quote an instance: the Liṅga on the Samādhi of Puṇḍalika, who was responsible for the installation of the image of Viṭṭhala at Paṇḍharpur, is worshipped by all the visitors to this pilgrim centre. It is interesting to note that some of the famous centres of the Liṅga worship (*Jyotir-liṅgas*) are said to have been cemeteries originally. The *Skānda P.* narrates that the following places were originally divine Smaśānas (divya-smaśāna): Mahākāla-vana, Avimuktaka, Ekāmraka, Bhadrakāla, Karavīra forest, Kolāgiri, Kāśī, Prayāga, Amareśvara, Bharata, Kedāra, and Rudra-mahālaya. [4]

It is worth noting that 'in Phœnicia, in Greece, and among the Etruscans phalli were often placed over the tombs.' [5]

Kinds of Lingas

Tradition has it that fourteen crores of Bāṇa-liṅgas are found in eight different parts of the world, one crore each in the Amarapati-kṣetra, Mahendra mountain, Gaṇḍakī in Nepal, Kānyakubja and Tīrthāraṇya, three crores each in Śrīgiri (Śrī-śaila), Liṅga-śaila and Kaligarta. Besides it is said that the Gaṇḍaki supplies six varieties of liṅga stones, which are called respectively, Śivanābha, Aghora, Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Tatpuruṣa and Īśāna—of which the Aghora alone is unfit for worship. [6] The origin of the liṅgas in the Narmada is ascribed to the Asura Bāṇa. [7] The Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa-Saṁvāda gives some interesting details in regard to the worship of the Liṅga. It is said that different liṅgas should be worshipped inside and outside the houses. Those used inside by

1. Cf. Kittel, *Linga Kultus*, pp. 5, 6; *I. A.* I, p. 15.
2. *Skānda P. Kaumārikā-kh.*, Adh. II. 58.
3. Crooke, *op. cit*, II. p. 58.
4. *Skānda P. Avanti-kṣetra Mā.*, (*Avanti-khaṇḍa*), 1, 1. 32. It should also be noted that the oft-quoted twelve Jyotir-lingas are:
Saurāṣṭre Somanātham ca Śrī-śaile Mallikārjunam
Ujjayinyām Mahākālam Oṅkāram-amaleśvaram ||
Paraḷyām Vaijanātham ca Ḍākinyām Bhīmaśaṅkaram
Setubandhe tu Rāmeśam Nāgeśam Dārukāvane ||
Vārāṇasyām tu Viśveśam Tryambakam Gautamītaṭe
Himālaye tu Kedāram Ghṛṣṇeśam tu Śivālaye ||
Etāni Jyotir-liṅgāni .... ||
5. Heras, *MS*; cf. also Scott, *Phallic Worship*.
6. Oppert, *Original Inhabitants of India*. p. 382 f.
7. *Ibid.*

householders should be made of gold, or precious stones, or quick-silver, or of other similar material. There exist twenty-two various kinds of such liṅgas. The Brāhmin householders should use *liṅgas* made of rock-crystal, Ksatriyas of silver, Vaiśyas of bell-metal, Śūdras of earth, and Rākṣasas of gold. Further, in the ritual of Pañcāyatana are mentioned various kinds of *liṅgas* which can be worshipped, as the Narmadā or Bāṇa-liṅga, an artificial liṅga, Pāṇipīṭha-liṅga, an earthen liṅga, one consisting of a jewel, or one made of butter, or one of gold, silver or copper, or one which represents life, is drawn as it were from the heart.[1] We need not, however, enter into the other details.

It is interesting to observe that the main philosophical tenets of the Liṅgāyats centre round the cult of the Liṅga. Besides, the small images of this emblem carved in ivory, gold or crystal are often worn as ornaments about the neck. The pious use them in prayers and often have them buried with them. The devotees of Śiva have it written on their foreheads in the form of a perpendicular mark. The maternal emblem is likewise a religious type; and the worshippers of Viṣṇu represent it on their forehead by a horizontal mark, with three short perpendicular lines.[2]

Varieties of Liṅga

The various Āgamas, Purāṇas, and other allied works give details regarding the different kinds of Liṅgas, and also describe how they should be installed. We have decided to give a brief survey of the same.[3]

(1) *Cala-liṅgas*—Cala or Jaṅgama liṅgas include those made of earth, metals, precious stones, wood, stone, or those made for the occasion (*Kṣaṇika liṅgas*).

(*a*) The *Mṛṇmaya* (*Earth*) *liṅgas* may be made of baked or unbaked clay.

(*b*) *Lohaja and the Ratnaja liṅgas*—The metal used for preparing the liṅga consists of eight kinds: gold, silver, copper, bell-metal, iron, lead, brass and tin. The *Ratnaja* liṅgas are prepared out of pearls, coral, cat's eye (Vaidūrya), quartz crystal, topaz (*puṣyarāja*), emerald and blue stones.

(*c*) *Dāruja* or wood *Liṅgas*-are made of timber of the Śami, Madhuka, Karṇikāra, Maṇḍūka, Tiṇḍuka, Arjuna, Pippal, and Udumbara trees. The Kāmika Āgama adds some more names e. g. Khadira, Candana, Sāla, Bilva, Badarī, and Devadāru.

(*d*) *Śailaja-liṅgas* (stone) probably include also Cala-liṅgas. They are worn by the Jaṅgamas, Liṅgavants or Liṅgāyats.

(*e*) *Kṣaṇika-liṅgas* (momentary)-They may be made of *saikata* (sand), uncooked rice, cooked rice, river-side clay, cow-dung, butter, rudrākṣa-seeds, sandal paste, Kūrca grass, flowers, joggery and flour.

(2) *The Acala or Sthāvara-liṅgas*—The various works differ in regard to the enumeration of the *Acala-liṅgas*.

1. *Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa-Saṁvāda*, Ch. 18; Oppert, *op. cit.*, pp. 382 ff.
2. Westropp and Wake, *Symbol Worship*, p. 19.
3. Cf. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. II. i. pp. 76 ff.

(a) *The Suprabhedāgama* classifies them under nine heads: The *Uttamottama-Svāyambhuva, Pūrva* (Purāṇa). *Daivata*; the *Uttama-madhyama*—Gāṇapatya, Āsura, Sura; the *Uttamādhama*–Ārṣa, Rākṣasa, Mānuṣa; the *Madhyamādhama*, and the Bāṇa-liṅgas.

(b) The *Mānasāra* details six kinds: Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kālāmukha, Vāma, Bhairava, and a variety which is not mentioned.

(c) The *Makuṭāgama* enumerates only four kinds: Daivika, *Ārṣaka*, *Gāṇapa* and the *Mānuṣa-liṅgas.*

(d) The Kāmikāgama describes six kinds: Svāyambhuva, Daivika, Ārṣaka Gāṇapatya, Mānuṣa and Baṇa-liṅgas.

However, we shall briefly describe the various types below.

(1) The *Svāyambhuva-liṅga* according to the Kāmikāgama is one which rose up and came into existence by itself and had existed from time immemorial.

(2) The *Daivika-liṅgas*, according to *Makuṭāgama*, are to be known by their characteristic shapes. In fact, they may be of the shape of a flame or resemble a pair of hands held in the Añjali pose; they may have a rough exterior with elevations and depressions, deep hollows and scars resembling *tanka* (chisel) and *śūla* (trident). The Daivika-liṅgas do not possess the *Brāhma* or *Pārśva-sūtras.*

(3) The *Gāṇapa-liṅgas* are believed to have been set by Gaṇas. They are of the shape of the fruits of cucumber, citron, wood-apple or palm.

(4) The *Ārṣa–liṅgas* are set up and worshipped by Ṛṣis. They are without *Brahmasūtras*, and are spheriodical in shape, with the top portion less broad than the lower portion like an unhusked cocoa-nut fruit.

(5) The *Mānuṣa-liṅgas* (cf. for varieties below) are got up by human hands. They are made of three parts e.g. of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudrabhāgas respectively. On the Rudrabhāga are carved certain lines called Brahmasūtras. The tops (Śirovartana) are fashioned in a number of forms.

(6) The *Sarvadeśika*–liṅgas–are classed as Uttama, Madhyama, and Adhama.

(7) The *Sarva–śama* liṅgas form the second class of Mānuṣa-liṅgas. They are also called as Sarvatobhadra (cf. Māyāmata and the Kāmikāgama).

(8) The *Vardhamāna* or the *Sureḍhya* liṅgas. In this the proportion of the three parts (bhāga) is rather different.

(9) We need not describe the others *e.g.* Svabhika or Anaḍhya or Āḍhya in detail.

Their Size The size of the Liṅgas varies according as they belong to any of the three types of the shrines e.g. *Drāviḍa, Vesara*, and the *Nāgara* (cf. 5 above).

The Manusa Liṅgas and their divisions: Among the Mānuṣa–lingas are included five more varieties namely the Aṣṭottaraśata-liṅga, the Sahasra–liṅga, the Dhāra·liṅga, the Śaiveṣṭya·liṅga, and the Sureḍhya-liṅga.

The carving on the Aṣṭottara-śata or Sahasra-liṅgas is done on the Pūjābhāga. The Dhāra-liṅgas are liṅgas whose Pūjābhāga has 'around it vertical-fluted facets

ranging from five to sixty-four in number. It should be noted in this connection that the Mukhaliṅgas are distinguished from the other Liṅgas in that they bear one or more human faces sculptured on them.

The Pīṭhas

As Gopinatha[1] Rao observes,' the Pīṭhas are named according to the number and form of the different kinds of mouldings, such as Bhadra-pīṭha, Mahāmbuja-pīṭha, Śrīkara-pīṭha, Vikara-pīṭha, Mahāvajra-pīṭha, Saumyaka-pīṭha, Śrīkāmya-pīṭha, Candra-pīṭha, and Vajra-pīṭha. The various items of the mouldings are known as Upāna, Jagatī, Kumuda, Padma, Kampa, Kaṇṭha, Paṭṭikā, Nimna and Ghṛta-vāi.'

The Materials

It is said that 'the Liṅga should be made out of Puṁśilā or the male stone, while the Piṇḍikā, or Pīṭha of Strīśilā or female stone.

It should also be observed that the Liṅgas are of different types : *Ekamukha-liṅga*, *Caturmukha-liṅga* (consisting of the four faces of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśa, and Sūrya respectively), Pañca-mukha-liṅga, Aṣṭa-mukha-liṅga, and others.

1. Gopinatha Rao, *E H. I.*, Vol. II. i., pp. 101 ff.

CHAPTER VI

AMMA-SAKTI

Historical Development-Some Aspects of Ammā-Śakti—Spread of Śāktism—Grāma-devatās—Śākta Sects and Devotees—Origin of Śāktism—The Tantras—Śākta Philosophy and Yoga—Śāktism in Bengal.

I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Introductory—Proto-Indian Period—The Ṛgveda—The Atharvaveda—The Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads—Mahābhārata—Later literature—Tāmil Literature.

(a) *Introductory*

Introductory

The history of the Mother Goddess Ammā, the Supreme Creatrix of the universe, is of an absorbing interest. Woodroffe rightly observes: 'When we throw our minds back upon the history of this worship we see stretching away into the remote and fading past the figure of the mighty Mother of Nature, most ancient amongst the ancients; the Ādyā-Śakti, the Dusk Divinity, many-breasted, crowned with towers, whose veil is never lifted, Isis, 'the one who is all that has been, is and will be,' Kālī, Hathor, Cybele, the cow-Mother Goddess Idā, Tripura-sundarī, the Ionic Mother, Tef the spouse of Shu by whom he effects the birth of all things, Aphrodite, Astarte in whose groves the Baalim were set, Babylonian Mylitta, Buddhist Tārā, the Mexican Ish, Hellenic Osea, the consecrated, the free and pure, African Selembo, who like Pārvatī roamed the Mountains, Roman Juno, Egyptian Bast-the flaming mistress of Life, of Thought, of Love, whose festival was celebrated with wanton joy, the Assyrian Mother Succoth Benoth, Northern Freia, Mūla-prakṛti, Semele, Māyā, Ishtar, Saitic Neith-Mother of the Gods, eternal deepest ground of all things, Kuṇḍalī, Guhya-mahā-bhairavī and all the rest.' [1]

The worship of the Mother Goddess Ammā, who is the same as the Sumerian Ama, comes from a remote antiquity. While comparing the statuettes of the Mother Goddess found in the Indus Valley region, with those of Western Asia, Marshall makes an emphatic remark: 'Even, however, without the analogy of these images from Western Asia, there would be a strong presumption in favour of the examples from Mohenjo-Daro, Harappa, and Baluchistan being effigies of the great Mother Goddess or of one or other of her local manifestations. For, in no country in the world has the worship of the Divine Mother been from time immemorial so deep-rooted and ubiquitous as in India. Her shrines are found in every town and hamlet throughout the length and breadth of the land.' [2]

One can very easily see through the Vedic and post-Vedic literature the gradual development of the cult of Ammā in India. It has been described that she was the Goddess of the Barbaras, Pulindas, Śabaras, Kirātas and other wild tribes. Even so she commanded respect and adoration from the higher classes including the nobles and kings.

---

1. Woodroffe, *Śakti and Śākta*, I, p. 128.
2. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilisation*, I, pp. 50-57.

Besides the various references in the Epics, the Purāṇas, the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, which mentions the installation of the Goddess Madirā,[1] and other works, the archæological evidence also throws light on the early prevalence of this cult throughout India. The excavations at Lauriya-nandangarh have yielded amongst other objects a small repouse gold plaque bearing the figure of a nude female, which Coomaraswamy erroneously calls as the Earth Goddess of the Burial Hymn.[2] A seated figure in the same early style, with an inscription designating it, or rather her, as a Yakṣī is in *pūjā* at Mathurā under the name of Manasā Dēvī.[3] Further there is a considerable group of Mauryan and Śuṅga terra-cottas (belonging to the fifth up to the first Cen. A.D.) of which examples are found in different sites extending from Pāṭaliputra to Taxila e. g. Pāṭaliputra, Kosam, Saṅki-a, Basrah, Taxila, Bhita, Nagari, and Mathura. These moulded plaques and modelled heads and busts represent in most cases a standing female divinity, with very elaborate coiffure, dressed in a tunic or nude to the waist, and with a *dhoti* or *shirt* of diaphanous muslin. Despite the garment, especial care is taken to reveal the mount of Venus in apparent nudity, a tendency almost equally characteristic of the stone sculpture in the Śuṅga, Āndhra and Kushāna periods. Other plaques represent male and female couples like the Mithuna and Umā-Maheśvara groups of later art. Besides, numerous representations of Yakṣīs and Vṛkṣakas are found at Bharhut, Bodhagayā, Sāñcī, Elurā, Bādāmi and other centres (cf. under *Minor Gods*). The best of the illustrations occur on the coins of the Kushāṇa period. One of the coins of Huvishka contains two figures, one male and the other female, standing facing each other, with a Kushāṇa monogram between them, the former being described as Bhavēśa (*Oeso*) and the latter as Nanā, the latter of which seems to be the same as *Umā* as the figure is to be found on an unique coin of the same Kushāṇa ruler where the Goddess was correctly described as Umā (O M M O) by the die-cutter.[4] The representations of the Mother Goddess are also to be found on the coins of Bhadraghoṣa (e.g. Bhadrā), and the Kuṇindas (probably Lakṣmī). Further the Durgā temple at Aihoḷe and the octagonal Muṇḍeśvarī temple near Bhabua in the Shahabad District[5] (probably built during the reign of King Harṣa) show the early prevalence of the Mother cult in India.

The main legend which throws light on the wide prevalence of the cult during the Purāṇic times is as follows[6] :

" After the death of Satī, Śiva, overcome by grief and remorse, wandered about the world, carrying his wife's dead body on his head as a penance. The other gods were afraid lest Śiva should by this means obtain excessive power ; so Viṣṇu pursued him, and with the successive blows of his discus cut the body to bits. It fell to earth in fifty-one pieces, and around each there grew up a *pīṭha-sthāna*, a sacred place to

1. Shama Sastri, *Arthaśāstra* (trans), p.59. It is said that, 'In the centre of the city, the apartments of Aparājita, Apratihata, Jayanta, Vaijayanta, Śiva, Vaiśravaṇa, Aśvi, and the abode of the Goddess Madirā shall be made'.
2. Comaraswamy, *H.I.I.A.*, p.10.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Cf. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, p. 139; Rapson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1897, p. 324.
5. *A.S.I.A.R.*, 1902-03, p.42; 1923-24, p. 25.
6. Payne, *The Sāktas*, p. 7; cf. also *Matsya P.*, Adh. 13 ; *Brahmāṇḍa P. Uttarakhaṇḍa*, Adh. 44. Cf. *Appendix*.

which pilgrimages are made." Eventually the following among other places are mentioned in the list: Kāmagiri, Kālighāṭ, Jvālāmukhi, in the Punjab, Jaipur, in Orissa, at Mount Girnār (in the Bombay Presidency), Kangra, Ujjain, capital of Malva, Kāśi or Benares, and other centres. Further the existence of the cult of the Grāma-devatās in almost all the villages and towns in India already shows the strong hold of Śāktism on the minds of Indians.

During the later period a separate cult of the Mother Goddess which is more properly known as Śāktism came into vogue. According to Śāktism God is the Supreme Mother. As Monier Williams observes, it is a 'duality in unity,'[1] the underlying principle being 'a sexual dualism'.[2] In her supreme form Śakti is identified as Mahādevī, consort of Śiva, with whose worship Śāktism became inextricably bound up; yet she herself was conceived of as the creator of Śiva and superior to him, just as her lesser emanations, the Śaktis of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and the rest of the gods, were superior to their own male counter-parts; and, just as Śiva combined in himself the powers of all other gods and in the eyes of his later votaries became the Supreme God (Mahādeva), so did his female counterpart became the Supreme Goddess in the Śākta pantheon, reflecting in her own personality all female manifestations of the other divinity. Immediately after she was raised to this supreme position she assumed the rôle of the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. In fact we see this 'Dusk Divinity' of India in her different capacities: the Ādyā-Śakti and Mahā-Śakti, or Supreme Power of many names-as Jagadambā, Mother of the World, which is the play of Her who is named Lalitā, Mahātripura-sundarī, Mahā-kuṇḍalinī, Mahā-vaiṣṇavī, the Saphire-Devī who supports the world, Mahākālī, who dissolves it, Guhya-Mahādevī, the Tāriṇī, the Mahārājñī, the Great Queen, and all the rest.[4] She becomes the mysterious force behind all the universe, and the arch-sorceress, giver of supernatural powers and magical faculties.[5]

Though scholars like William Ward, the Abbé Dubois, H. H. Wilson, Monier Williams, Barth, William Crooke, and others have expressed their views on Śāktism rather in strong terms, namely, as indicating obscenity, bestiality, pious profligacy, etc., still Śāktism even as an experiment has achieved a good deal in the field of religion.

Marshall pointed out that female statuettes akin to those from the Indus Valley and Baluchistan have been found in large numbers and over a wide range of countries between Persia and the Ægean, notably in Elam, Mesopotamia, Transcaspia, Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine, Cyprus, Crete, the Cyclades, the Balkans, and Egypt. He further points out the close resemblances between these in the following terms: 'Their central figure is a mother or Nature Goddess, who, out of her own being, creates her partner God, just as the Indian Mother Goddess creates Śiva, and then in union with him becomes the Mother of all things. Like the Mahādevī of the Śāktas, she is at once beneficent and malignant, averter of evils but herself a dread power: ruler of

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 180.
2. Barth, *The Religions of India*, p. 200.
3. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, I, p. 51.
4. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 383.
5. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-6; Barth, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-2.

passions and appetites, and mistress of magic and sorceries; and her ritual is characterized by sexual promiscuity and sacrifices of a specially sanguinary character.' [1]

(b) *The Proto-Indian Period*

The various inscriptions and clay statuettes of the Mother Goddess found in Mohenjo Daro and Harappa throw light on the early history of Ammā, the Supreme Creatrix of the universe. In fact they have made it possible to trace the origin of the Mother Goddess to that early period. In the absence of any efforts towards the decipherment of the inscriptions then, Sir John Marshall made an emphatic statement, for instance, 'Now, of Śāktism there is no direct evidence at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa. Let me be clear on that point. What evidence there is, is merely suggestive.'[2] But the inscriptional evidence really points out that Ammā had attained a very high position by the side of Śiva.

Inscriptional Evidence

The proto-Indian inscriptions point out that Ammā was one of the three Great Gods who formed the Divine Triad. In prehistoric Sumer the names of the three Gods were An, Enlil and Ama. Evidently these were the same as the three Gods of India: Śiva, Mūrugaṉ, and Ammā. The expression Ammā connoted the Mother Goddess in the proto-Indian times.

In the inscriptions the name of the Mother Goddess is found among the constellations of the Zodiac. She was afterwards called Virgin i.e. 'Kanyā.'[3]

In one of the inscriptions Ammā is styled as Mīnakaṇṇi,[4] which is also the name of the Goddess of Madurā e. g. Mīnākṣi ' rather a half-Sanskritized form of the above-Mīn (Dravidian)-akṣi (eye = Sanskrit)· Another inscription speaks of the ' Joined life of the united three Great Gods.'[5] Some of the inscriptions speak of Ammāṉ, which is the same as the later *ardha-nārīśvara.*

Archaeological Evidence

Marshall has given all the archæological details of the various statuettes found on the Indus Valley sites.

There are a large number of female figurines of terra-cotta, found both at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, which are paralleled by kindred examples from the neighbouring country of Baluchistan. There are also others like the woman kneading dough or holding a dish of cakes in her arms, which are supposed to be probably merely toys, without any religious meaning; and others, like those with children in their arms (Pl. XCV, 20), or in a state of pregnancy which seem to be ex-veto offerings, perhaps with a magical significance, for the purpose of procuring offspring.[6]

The figurines are generally portrayed in the form of a standing and almost nude female, wearing a band or girdle about her loins with elaborate head-dress and collar, and occasionally with ornamental cheek *cones* and a long necklace, wearing ear-ornaments which take the form of shell-like cups suspended by bands on either side of the head, while the head-dress above is more or less crescent-shaped.[7]

---

1. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 58.
2. Marshall, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 57.
3. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions,' *J. U. B.*, V.i.p.7.
4. Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 338.
5. Marshall, *M. D*, No, 209.
6. Cf. *E. R. E.*, X, 242.
7. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 49.

Sir John Marshall observes that the cult of 'the earth or Mother Goddess is evidenced by an oblong sealing from Harappa (Pl. XIII, 12), on which a nude female figure is depicted upside down with legs apart and with a plant issuing from her womb.' But, as we have observed in the previous chapter the representation is not the figure of any woman but of Śiva depicted as a Fertility God. Secondly, in the right upper corner of a square seal of 'a unique variety' found at Mohenjo Daro, there is the stylized representation of a Pippal tree in the centre of which is a figure which is described by Marshall as the female spirit of the tree. [1] But Father Heras observes that this is the figure of Śiva and not of the female spirit of the tree as Marshall would have it. [2]

Amma and ring-stones

The fact of the discovery of the ring-stones in the proto-Indian sites is of unique importance. The inscriptions speak of the identification of Śiva and the Liṅga. It is not improbable that the Mother Goddess must have been identified with the Yoni or the female counter-part as the productive power of the universe.

(c) *Ammā in the Vedic Period*

Ṛgveda

No direct reference is made in connection with the Mother Goddess in the *Ṛgveda*. Some scholars have laid emphasis on the early occurrence of Uṣas, Pṛthivi, Aditi, Vāk, Puraṁdhi, Dhiṣaṇā, Rātrī, Sarasvatī, Iḷā, Bhāratī, etc., and have attributed the development of Śāktism to these. But the *Ṛgveda* does not refer to any exclusive cult of Śakti, so that it could have acted as the origin of the later all-pervading nature of the Mother Goddess.

As we have observed before, the beginnings of the early history of Ammā can be traced to the proto-Indian period. In fact, if our statement regarding the civilization of the Vāhīkas be held as correct, then that should help us in proving that the Śakti cult must have first developed in a later period in the land of the Vāhīkas alone.

The *Ṛgveda* uses the expression Ambaka in connection with Rudra. But that has hardly any connection with the Mother Goddess Ammā. There is, however, an indirect reference made to the Mother Goddess in the *Ṛgveda*. While discussing the problem of Śiva it has been observed by us that the stanza most probably refers to the Divine Triad of the Mohenjo Daro period. The pertinent point under consideration is that the 'female (Mother Goddess) is said to be joying and triumphing in arts of the magic.' [3] It is worth noting that the word Māyā is used for the expression 'arts of magic.' The word Māyā is used in connection with the Asura (e.g. Asura Māya) in the *Ṛgveda*. The Asuras mentioned in the *Ṛgveda* were clearly proto-Indians. The people of India originally were the possessors of the art of witchcraft and magic as even the *Atharvaveda* would show, and eventually it must have been one of their notions that they owed it to the Mother Goddess. Further, the word Māyā is used in the sense of Illusion by Śaṅkara, and it also becomes the brunt of the philosophical teachings of the Śāktas, where it is considered as a real entity. Thus according to Śāktism, the

1. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 64.
2. Heras, 'The Plastic Representation of God amongst the Proto-Indians', *Sardesai Commemoration Volume*, pp. 229–30.
3. *Ṛgveda*, VII. 104.24.; cf. under the *Vrātyas* (Chapter II, p. 21).

word Māyā (an impure form of Śakti) is used in regard to the universe itself. The great Pāśupatācārya Śvetāśvatara designates Rudra-Śiva as *māyin*. If this be so, then we can very easily understand how the 'Strī' or woman, possessing Māyā as described in the above lines, must have belonged to the cult of the Asuras or proto-Indians.

The *Atharvaveda* throws light on this problem. In Book XV, while describing

Atharvaveda

the various functionings of the Ekavrātya, it is described: "Of him in the eastern quarter, Śraddhā is the *Puṁscalī* or harlot; Mitra is the Māgadha...."

The Puṁscalī referred to here must be the same as Ammā of the proto-Indian period [1]. That the Puṁscalī belonged to the cult of the non-Aryans is clearly proved by the fact that she is also included in the list of victims at the Puruṣamedha inthe Yajurveda.[2] Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, while describing the nude images of the Mother Goddess on the Mohenjo Daro sites, expresses that the various figurines obtaining on the proto-Indian sites happened to be those of the Puṁścalī. He says, 'Can there be any doubt that they represent the Puṁścalī associated with Ēkavrātya ?"[3] Then why such a word as Puṁścalī meaning 'a harlot' is used in this connection ? This may be either on account of the sheer ignorance of the Aryans regarding the exact relationship between Śiva and Ammā of the proto-Indians, or perhaps it is due to their feeling of total detestation of the cult of the Mother Goddess.

The *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* for the first time reveals the real character of Ammā.

Ambikā in Yajurveda

She appears in *Tryambaka Homa* where offerings are made to her conjointly with her brother and husband Rudra so that they may not slay the sacrificer and his family. The contents of the Tryambaka Homa may be summarised as follows: The sacrificer bakes in the sacrificial fire as many cakes as there are members in his family; removes them all into a dish, and taking a fire-brand from the sacrificial fire, he carries them aside towards the north. He keeps one of the cakes aside, and offers the rest on *palāśa* leaves at the cross-roads, cutting out a bit from each of them. He then buries the additional cake representing Rudra's favourite animal, the mole, in an ant-hill, in order to free his cattle from his darts. Then he collects the bits of cake, and returns to the sacrificial fire, excepting the satisfied God to make him rich and prosperous, and invokes his blessing on his own family and cattle. The members of the sacrificer's family as well as unmarried girls walk thrice round the sacrificial fire, the former begging God Tryambaka to free them from death and not from immortality, and the latter to bestow husbands on them. Finally, the sacrificer takes the bits of cake collected from the offerings at the cross-roads, and having packed them into two net-work baskets (one for Rudra and the other for Ambikā), ties them to the two ends of a bamboo staff or the beam of a balance to show probably the equality of the two deities, and goes out towards the north until he meets a tree or an ant-hill, and fastens them there-on. He then requests Rudra to depart to his own country and returns home again.' [4]

1. Cf. Chapter II, under Vrātyas.
2. *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, XXX, 8.
3. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 43.
4. Cf. *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*; cf. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra-Śiva*, pp. 56-57.

The above passage is important from various points of view. The expression Tryambaka, which means later on 'three-eyed', is of very obscure origin The *Ṛgveda* uses the word in connection with Rudra.[1] It is further used in the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* [2] and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[3] The *Ṛgveda* describes: 'Tryambaka we worship, sweet augmentor of prosperity.' The exact passage in the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* runs as: "This is thy portion, Rudra, graciously accept it together with thy sister Ambikā: Svāhā! This is thy portion; thy victim is mouse. We have satisfied Rudra; we have satisfied the God Tryambaka." The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] interprets the above passage as: "Ambikā, indeed, is the name of his sister; and this share belongs to him along with her; since this share belongs to him with a Strī or female, he is called Tryambaka." The word has been variously interpreted by different scholars. Sāyaṇa, while commenting on the passage of the *Tryambaka Homa* says that, 'it is said that we offer sacrifice to the father and mother of the three gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.' Roth interprets the expression as meaning 'having three wives or sisters.'[4] Max Müller[5] and Macdonell[6] interpret it as 'having three wives or sisters.' Keith opines that the expression may mean 'having three sisters or mothers.'[7] Bhandarkar interprets the word as '(the God) born of three mothers.'[8] He also identifies these *Ambās* with the Mother Goddess of the proto-Indian period. It must be specifically mentioned that the *Ṛgvedic* expression Tryambaka must be distinguished from the one that occurs in the later documents. The proper rendering of the word Tryambaka leads us to the meaning 'one (born) of three mothers.' Therefore this seems to refer to the exclusive cult of the *Ṛgveda*. But later on the Brāhman poets made the best of their efforts towards causing an amalgamation of the two Gods Rudra and Śiva. Thus the present passage clearly brings out the original nature and relationship of Śiva and Ammā. The passage in the *Yajurveda* calls Ambikā as the sister of Rudra. This probably throws light on the brother and sister form of marriage which was originally so prevalent amongst the Vrātyas. The *Śatapatha Brahmaṇa* elucidates: 'We worship Tryambaka, the fragrant bestower of the husbands. Husbands doubtless are the support of women.'[9]

We know of one instance in the *Mahābhārata*, namely, that Rukmiṇī at the time of her marriage first went in and paid respects to Durgā. The custom is prevalent even now. Thus the early traces of this notion seem to have been recorded in the above stanza. Venkataramanayya has rightly discussed the point. He says, 'The unmarried girls were enjoined to invoke Rudra conjointly with Ambikā to grant them husbands. The interpretation of Tryambaka as Striyambaka in the Brāhmaṇa, and the invocation addressed to the pair Rudra and Ambikā, by unmarried girls for husbands, strongly suggest that Rudra and Ambikā, were related to each other not only

1. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 59. 12.
2. *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā*, III, 58.
3. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II,6. 29.
4. Roth and Böhtlingk, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, III, pp.456-9.
5. Max Müller, *Vedic Hymns*, II, (S B.E. xxxii), p.384.
6. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p.74.
7. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, I, p.143.
8. D.R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p.42.
9. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 2,6.2,14.

as brother and sister but also as husband and wife.'[1] We, however, accept this statement with one reservation, namely, that the relationship between Śiva and Ammā was not that of a brother and sister. This was eventually an interpretation clearly superimposed by the Aryans.

Aranyakas and Upanisads

It is not till the period of the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads that we are able to trace the importance attached by the Aryans to the Mother Goddess. During this period, efforts were made towards the Aryanization of the various gods and goddesses originally belonging to the Vrātya pantheon. Payne rightly observes that, 'there are hints of a developing interest in female deities. Each of the great gods has his female counterpart. To Viṣṇu there corresponds Vaiṣṇavī or Lakṣmī; to Brahmā, Brahmāṇī and Sarasvatī; to Kārttikēya, God of War, Kārttikeyā, to Indra Indrāṇī, To Yama Yamī, to Varāha Varāhī, and to Śiva Devī or Īśānī."[2] If we accept this remark with, however, a reservation, namely, that Śiva was already closely related to Ammā right from the beginning, then we may be able to find out how all else is a later imitation on behalf of the Aryans. Thus if Śiva had his spouse, all the other Aryan gods also must have one each.

Further, various Aryan names were introduced in the cult of the Mother Goddess. The words Karālā, Karālānanā, Kātyāyanī, etc. fully indicate this.

In the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* Rudra is called the husband of Ambikā or Umā.[3] The text further gives the other names of the goddess, namely, Durgā, Kātyāyanī, Karālī, Varadā, Kanyākumārī, Sarvavarṇā, Cchandasām Mātā, Vedamātā and Sarasvatī.[4] The exact reference to Durgā is made as 'Tanno Durgiḥ pracodayāt', thus indicating that the word Durgā is a later Sanskritized form of the original Durgā. Thus we find in this text how the Aryanization of the Mother Goddess is effected by a slow process. Especially the expressions Kātyāyanī, Sarasvatī, Varadā, Cchandasām Mātā, Veda-mātā are absolutely of Brahmanic origin. That, deliberate effort towards the amalgamation of the Vrātya deity into the Aryan pantheon was being made, becomes evident from the expression Kanyā kumārī (one of which is a Dravidian word). It is really the 'Virgin' Goddess that we find Aryanized here.

Weber expressed an idea that many of the names e.g Kālī, Karālī Kātyāyanī, Durgā, etc. are derived from the 'fire' cult or the functionings of fire. The explanation given by him is of a startling nature "Moreover", says he, "Kātyāyanī, Kanyākumārī, and Durgā are already well-known to us as names of Śiva's consort: and indeed, they all appear to carry us back to the flame of fire. It is true that as regards Kātyāyanī this is somewhat difficult: though when we consider the great importance of the Kātya family in reference to the sacrificial system of the Brāhmans, it does not seem very improbable that a particular kind of fire, which perhaps was introduced by one of the Kātyas, was called after him, and that this name was then associated with Kālī, Karālī, and Durgā, which are originally mere appellations of fire.

1. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra-Śiva*, p. 29.
2. Payne, *The Śāktas*, pp. 37–38.
3. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, X. 18. The exact passage runs as: '*Namo hiraṇya-bāhave hiraṇyapataye Ambikāpataye Umāpataye namo namaḥ.*'
4. *Ibid.*, X; *cf.* also *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, 1, 2, 4, etc.

Kanyā-kumārī or 'the maidenly,' is a very fitting epithet of the holy, pure, sacrificial flame; and even at the time of the Periplus *i.e.* of Pliny, we find her worship extended to the southernmost point of India, to the Cape which was then, as now, called after her Cape Comorin; but does it not appear that she was then no longer worshipped as the sacrificial flame, but as the wife of Śiva himself (whose name Nīlakaṇtha) Lassen (Ind.. Ant. i. 194) finds rendered in the Periplus?" In like manner he discusses the question of Durgā also. However, the data that has become available to us now does not allow us to postulate the theory of the priority of the cult of Agni to that of the Mother Goddess.

Even much more interesting is the story detailed in the *Kena* or the *Talavakāra Upaniṣad.* The story runs as follows:[1]

"On one occasion Brahmā gained a victory for the gods. As, however, they were disposed to ascribe the credit of the success to themselves, Brahmā appeared for the purpose of disabusing them of their mistake. The gods did not know him, and commissioned first Agni, and then Vāyu, to ascertain what this apparition was. When in answer to Brahmā's inquiry, the two gods represented themselves, the one as having the power to burn, and the other as able to blow away, respectively, a blade of grass; but they were unable to do this, and returned without ascertaining who he was. Indra was then commissioned.

"They then said to Indra: 'Maghavan, ascertain what this apparition is.' He replied, 'so be it;' and approached that being who vanished from him. In that sky he came to a woman who was very resplendent, Umā Haimavatī. To her he said, 'what is this apparition'? She said, 'It is Brahmā. In this victory of Brahmā, exult' By this it was Brahmā."

Śaṅkara commented on the word Umā as meaning 'Vidyā' or knowledge. Sāyaṇa gave the same explanation while interpreting this word, as well as Soma (Sa-Umā according to him). Weber points out: "This last passage is the only one in the circle of the Vedic writings in which with the exception of that in the *Kena Upaniṣad*, I have as yet directly met with the name Umā; for the expression 'Umā-Sahāya' in the *Kaivalya Upaniṣād* no longer belongs to the Vedic period; and further, though the commentaries, in other places also explain 'Soma' by 'Umayā sahita', accompanied by Umā, such an interpretation is just as groundless as in the texts commented on by Sāyaṇa, when the word signifies simply the Soma libation.'[2] However, the real importance of the passage lies in the fact that Umā is described as Umā Haimavatī. We know that Śiva is called as a 'dweller in the white mountain,' namely the Himālayas in the proto-Indian period. Eventually, this is just one step further in the case of the Vedic Indians. It is only in the Upaniṣadic period, that they imbibed the real notion of Ammā as a goddess of the Himālayas, wherein is situated Śiva's Kailāsa. It is not indeed in the way in which Weber pointed it out, namely, "Again why is she called Haimavatī? Is it that the Brahmavidyā (divine knowledge) came originally from the Haimavatī to the Aryans dwelling in Madhyadēśa (the central region of Hindustan)? No. But an account of

1. *Kena Upaniṣad*, Sections III and IV.
2. Weber, *Ind. Stu.* ii, 186, ff; cf. also Müir, *O. S. T.*, IV, pp.42ff.

the word Giriśānta, Giriśāya, Giritra, in which we recognize the germ of the conception of Śiva's dwelling on Kailāsa. He is the tempest who rages in the mountains , and his wife therefore properly called Pārvatī. Haimavatī, 'the mountaineer,' 'the daughter of Himavat.' At the same time, it is not clear what we have to understand by his wife; and further she is, perhaps, originally not his wife, but his sister, for Umā and Ambikā is Rudra's sister." [1] And if one can agree with the explanation, given by us above in regard to Haimavatī, then the historical aspect of the problem would become still more clear and of an easy understanding. In view of this, is it possible that the expression *Umā* is only an Aryan rendering of the original Ammā of the proto-Indians ? It is also worth noting how the influence of Brahmā is brought to bear upon the mind of the people through this passage.

Mahabharata

During the period of the *Mahābhārata* many new names and aspects of the Mother Goddess are introduced. The cult of Kṛṣṇa is being slowly introduced. It is also stated in the *Virāṭaparvan* that the Mother Goddess takes delight in spirituous liquor flesh and sacrificial victims (cf. *infra*). However, we shall just try to summarize the main results below.

In the *Bhīṣma Parvan* is detailed the prayer of Arjuna to Durgā. He invokes, "Reverence be to Siddha-senānī (leader of the Siddhas), the noble, the dweller on Mandāra, the Kumārī, Kālī, Kapālī, Kṛṣṇa-piṅgalā, Bhadra-kālī, Mahākālī, Caṇḍī, Caṇḍā ; Tāriṇī (deliveress,), Varavarṇinī (beautiful-coloured), fortunate Kātyāyanī, Karālī, Vijayā, Jayā, who bearest a peacock's tail for thy banner, adorned with various jewels, armed with many spears, wielding sword and shield, younger sister of the chief of cowherds (Kṛṣṇā), eldest, born in the family of cowherds, Nandā, delighting always in Mahiṣa's blood, Kauśikī, wearing yellow garments, loud-laughing, wolf-mouthed, deliverer in battle, Umā, Śākambharī, Śvetā (white one), Kṛṣṇā, (black one), destroyer of Kaiṭabha, Hiraṇyākṣī, Virūpākṣī, Dhūmrākṣī (golden, distorted, dark-eyed), Veda-śruti (tradition of the Veda), Jātavedasī...(Reverence be to her), who dwellest continually near to (—?)I mountain-precipices and sepulchres, mother of Skanda, divine Durgā, dweller in wilderness; Svāhā, Svadhā, Kalā, Kāṣṭhā (minute divisions of time), Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī, Mother of the Vedas and the Vedānta. Thou goddess art praised with pure heart. By thy favour let me be even victorious in battle. In deserts, fears, difficulties, and in the preservation of thy devout servants, and in Pātāla (nether-world) thou constantly abidest; and conquerest the Dānavas in battle, thou art Jambhanī (destroyer), Mohinī, Māyā, Hrī Śrī, Sandhyā, the luminous Sāvitrī, mother (Jananī), Tuṣṭi, Puṣṭi, Dhṛti, Dīpti (light), increaser of the moon, the power of the powerful battle, (all this) seen by the Siddhas and Caraṇas."[2]

In the *Virāṭaparvan* is given the address of Yudhiṣṭhira to Durgā. The passage is equally important as the above and gives the following details. Durgā is said to "have her perpetual abode on the Vindhya mountains, and to delight in spritual liquor, flesh and sacrificial victims."[3]

1. *Ibid*, i. 183. 2. *Bhīṣma Parvan*, Adh. 23.; Muir, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp 432-33.
3. *Virāṭa Parvan*, 178 ff. The exact stanza is as follows ;
विन्ध्ये चैव नगश्रेष्ठे तव स्थानं हि शाश्वतम् ॥ काले कालि महाकालि सीधुमांसपशुप्रिये ॥

It is worth while comparing this passage with the one in the *Mahābhārata* in connection with the so-called demoness worshipped by the Vrātyas.

These passages are usually dated in the third or fourth century A. D.[1] But some suggest even a later period e.g. the seventh or the eighth century A. D.[2] But, if we bring to mind all about the cult of the Vrātyas and their demon-goddess (as the author of the *Mahābhārata* would like to call her), then we can see how the beginnings of Śāktism must be traced to an earlier period.

The following passages from the *Mahābhārata* give a graphic description of Kālī. When Aśvatthāmā visited the camp of the Pāṇḍavas with the intention of destroying them, it is said, 'The warriors in the Pāṇḍava camp saw that embodiment as representing Death-night (Kālī), of black visage, and having bloody mouth and bloody eyes, wearing crimson garlands and smeared with crimson unguents, clad in a single piece of red cloth, with a noose in hand, and resembling an elderly lady, singing a dreadful song, and standing erect before their eyes, and about to lead away men and horses and elephants all bound in a strong rope. She appeared to take away various kinds of spirits, with dishevelled hair and bound together in a chord, as also many powerful car-warriors divested of their weapons'.[3]

Again, it is said that in the country of the Vāhīkas, 'a horrible demoness was worshipped in the populous town of Sākalapura, the capital of Madras. She is described as singing aloud a song of the following purpose, on the fourteenth night of the dark-half of every lunar month: "O! When shall I have the pleasure again of singing (hearing) the songs of these Vāhīkas? When shall I have a sumptuous feast of beef, pork, camel's and ass' flesh, as well as of rams and cocks with Gauḍīya wine to boot, in the company of the stout and fair Sākala women? Unlucky, indeed, is he who eats no such dainties."[4] This is apparently the description of Kālī and her worshippers. The passage is important from another point of view, namely, that it indicates the early origin of the Śākta cult in a land which was once occupied by the proto-Indians.

The *Mahābhārata* contains passages about the cult of Śakti. The expressions like Bhagaliṅga,[5] Māheśvarī prajā[6] (creation of Maheśvarī), the Mātṛkās (and their description),[7] Bhagadeva,[8] all these occur in the *Mahābhārata*. In the *Sabhā Parva*, it is stated that Jarā, a demoness, is installed in every house to keep away the demons, and that she is called the *Gṛhadevatā*.[9] Thus all these instances clearly show that the Śākta cult had already come into vogue during the period of the Mahābhārata.

Harivaṃśa

The *Harivaṁśa* throws further light on the subject. It is told how 'Viṣṇu with the idea of destroying Kaṁsa went to Pātāla and sought the aid of Nidrā-rūpiṇī (sleep in the form of time), how he further asked her to take birth as the ninth child of Yaśodā, while he would be born as the

1. *Payne, op. cit.*, p. 39.
2. Mazumdar, 'Durgā, Her Origin and History,' J.*R.A.S.*, 1906, p. 355.
3. *Mbh Sauptika-parvan*, 8, 76-78.
4. *Ibid* VIII, 44, 25-26.
5. *Anuśāsana* P., Adh. 58. 3.
6. *Ibid*, 45, 217.
7. *Salya* P., Adh. 47, Vs. 1 ff.
8. *Āśvamedhika* P., Adh. 43, 15.
9. *Mbh, Sabhā Parvan*, Adh. 18, 1 ff

eighth of Devakī; how an exchange would take place; and how when she was thrown on the rock she would go into the heavens, and join Him in his glory there. It is also described therein that the Devī would kill two demons, namely, Śumbha and Niśumbha and that she would be worshipped with animal sacrifice.[1]

Vaiśampāyana's address:—On another occasion Vaiśampāyana repeats a hymn to Āryā (Durgā) which had been "uttered by Ṛṣis of old." It begins as: 'Reverence be to Nārāyaṇī and to Goddess Tribhuvaneśvarī', thus indicating the first firm step towards Aryanizing the Goddess. Besides repeating the names mentioned in Arjuna's address to Durgā, she is called as the elder sister of Yama, and is said to have been worshipped by the (savage tribes of) Śavaras, Varvaras, and Pulindas. It is worth noting that she is also described as being fond of wine and flesh (surā-māṁsapriyā) as the goddess of wine (Surādevī), as being Sarasvatī in Vālmīki and Smṛti in Dvaipāyana, the science of Brahmā, or the Veda (Vidyānām Brahmavidyā) and as pervading the whole world. As Muir points out, 'The subject of this passage seems to be to take Durgā and her worship (the extensive prevalence of which could not be ignored by the Vaiṣṇavas) under the protection and patronage of Viṣṇu'.[2]

Again in the same work, another effort is made towards the Aryanization of this goddess. The hymns addressed to Durgā by Pradyumna, the son of Kṛṣṇa (9423 ff.), and by Aniruddha,[3] son of Pradyumna, are instances to the point. The goddess is here described as naked, and as being "adored by Ṛṣis and gods with flowers of eloquence" (1023-4). She is called the sister of Indra and Viṣṇu (Mahendra-Viṣṇu-bhaginī), and as Gautamī. Further, it is said that even Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, the Sun, Moon, and Wind,...all this world is pronounced by uttering the name of this goddess." It should be observed in this connection that the *Harivaṁśa* introduces stories of Umā regarding her double birth and shows how she was one of the three daughters of Menā, wife of Himavat e.g. Ekaparṇā, Ekapāṭalā and Aparṇā respectively. In the *Durgāstava* of the *Ṛgveda-pariśiṣṭa* which is placed between the 127th and 128th hymn of the tenth *Maṇḍala*, the sages are described to have appealed to Durgā for assistance. Therein Durgā is described as 'affording a refuge and being dear to the Bahvṛcas.'

Later Literature

It should be noted at the outset that the history of the Mother Goddess can be traced even to the pre-Vedic period. The various references made in regard to the Śakti cult in later literature naturally indicate how the cult was practised in later times, and at the most how the old system was being gradually Aryanized. Hence, we shall have to be cautious when such a statement as the one of Payne is made, "it was probably during the succeeding periods, that is about the time of the Gupta Empire, which has been compared with the Periclean age in Greece and the Elizabethan and Stuart years in England, that the Śākta cult most rapidly spread."

In the early centuries of the era, Īśvara Kṛṣṇa wrote the *Sāṅkhya-Kārikās*, which deals with the main ideas in regard to Puruṣa and Prakṛti, the two primeval entities of the universe. The poet-prince Kālidāsa wrote the *Kumārasambhava*,

1. *Harivaṁśa*, 2. Adh. 2, 37. 2. Muir, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 434; *Harivaṁśa*, I, Adh. 3.
3. *Harivaṁśa*, *Second Parva*, Adh. 120.

which is 'a refined work relating the story of Umā's marriage with Śiva'. The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* contains the *Devī Māhātmya*, called also *Caṇḍī Māhātmya* or *Saptaśatī*, which portion probably belongs to the sixth century. The work 'celebrates the mighty deeds of the goddess and refers to her daily worship and autumn festival.' Bāṇa, the court-poet of King Harṣa, wrote the *Caṇḍī-śataka* or 'An Ode to Caṇḍī' in a hundred verses. It is remarkable that the *Harṣacarita* describes that King Harṣa used to practise Śāktism and Tāntricism before he was actually converted to Buddhism.[1] All the incidental allusions in Bāṇa's works enable us to reconstruct a picture of the goddess-worship of the time.[2] During the period between 550–900 A. D. one can find the elements of Śāktism spread here and there in the Vaiṣṇava, Buddhist and Jain literature.[3] The *Mālatī-Mādhava* (8th Cen. A. D.) of Bhavabhūti throws a wonderful light on the worship of the Goddess.[4] The famous philosopher Śaṅkarācārya is said to have written many 'Śākta precis in prose and verse.' It is even asserted by Monier Williams that 'Śaṅkara placed a representation of the Śrī-Cakra in each of the four monasteries which he founded'.[5] Further Lakṣmīdhara ascribes the authorship of the work *Saundaryalaharī* to Śaṅkara.[6] Payne's remarks in this connection are worth noting: 'The truth seems to be,' says Payne, 'that Śaṅkara was a Smārta Brāhman, worshipping the five gods, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā, Sūrya, and Gaṇeśa. Possibly the Devī as Śāradā, the goddess of wisdom, was his Iṣṭa-devatā, his special *Devatā*, his special protectress, receiving in consequence more attention than the others. From his *Gītā* it appears that he practised Śākta Yoga. He proclaimed a lower kind of truth for ordinary men, and a higher for the philosopher, but he seems to have done all he could to help the movement for the purifying of temples, whether these were Śākta or of other Hindu sects. As an orthodox Brāhman, however, his desire would be to see an increase of Pañcāyatana temples. At Conjeeveram, for example, he was able to change the chief priests, and to introduce the worship of the five gods. Incidents like this probably lie behind traditions connecting him with the beginning of the Dakṣiṇācāra in Śāktism.[7]

The next important works regarding the early history of Śāktism are the Tantras. Besides the Tantras, Śāktism flourished through other sources. The famous drama *Karpūramañjarī* written in Prākṛit by Rājaśekhara (c. A. D. 900) contains an account of the Kaula magician Bhairavānanda and also an account of 'dola-yātrā' (swing-festival) of Gaurī. It is described here how Karpūramañjarī, the heroine, is put in a swing in front of the image of Pārvatī.'[8] The next work of importance is the *Vetāla-Pañcaśikhā*, wherein the Vetāla is said to have related twenty-five tales to king Vikrama, mostly consisting of Śākta practices. Further the *Siṁhāsana-dvātriṁśikā* contains Tāntric matter. The *Kālikā Purāṇa*, which is said to have been written in about the 14th century A. D. contains the famous blood-chapter (cf. under *Human Sacrifice*).

The following Upaniṣads, which are rather of a later date deal with the various aspects of Śāktism : the *Tripuratāpani Upaniṣad* (dealing with the Tripuratāpani–

1. Payne. *The Śāktas*, p. 39.
2. *Ibid*, p. 42.
3. *Ibid*, p. 42.
4. Cf. under *Ritual*.
5. Payne, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
6. *Ibid*, p. 43.
7. *Ibid*, p. 44.
8. *Ibid*, p. 46.

vidyā), the *Bhāvanopaniṣad*, the *Devyupaniṣad*, the *Kaulopaniṣad*, and the *Tārakopaniṣad*. Further the *Agastya* and the *Paraśurāma-sūtras* partly deal with the subject.

Tamil Literature

The early Tāmil literature throws a flood of light on the cult of the Mother Goddess. The Goddess was known as Ayai (Mother), or Koṭṭavai (the victorious Mother), or Koṭṭi (the slaughterer, by which name she is known in the Malayalam country). She was mainly the Goddess of the Maravar tribe. The early notion was that among the host of whimsical creatures in the battle-field, there is a dreadful figure whose favour the Maravars have secured by the offering of toddy, fried rice and the blood, marrow and intestines of victims,[1] and who marches in terrific majesty at the head of their ranks. She is said to move about the battle-field, with garlands of the entrails of victims on her person, and to give vent to a dreadful laughter at the sight of fallen enemies swimming in their blood.[2] Her standard has a lion on it; she rides a fleet stag; she holds a parrot; and countless imps follow as her retinue.[3] The name of this Great Demoness is Ayai or Koṭṭavai.[4]

The other Tāmil texts give a still more ghastly description. In the Paṭṭupaddu she is described 'as shaking her giant shoulders and dancing to her own song of triumph in the battle-field in the presence of her son Mūrugaṇ, with dishevelled hair and irregular teeth which adorn an abnormally large mouth; with eyes rolling through rage and with a frightful look; with ears having an owl and a snake for pendants and an awkward large belly, and with an awe-inspiring gait, while she picks out the eyes from a black stinking head which she is in the act of eating, her mouth dripping blood.[5] The *Śilappadikāram* gives some additional names of the Mother Goddess i.e. Kumārī, Gaurī, etc. The Goddess is described as 'the maid of the aborigines, who had her matted hair tied up like a crow on her head, with the shining skin of a young cobra; and the curved tusk of a boar fastened in her hair to resemble a crescent. She had a third eye on her fore-head and her throat was darkened by drinking poison. A string of tiger's teeth was her necklace. The stripped skin of a tiger was wound round her waist as a garment. She had an elephant's skin as her mantle. A bow bent and ready to shoot was placed in her hand and she was mounted on a stag with branch and antlers. Drums rattled and pipes squeaked in front of her image while the fierce Maravar slaughtered buffaloes at her altar. Oblations of rice mixed with blood and flesh were offered to her, as also perfumed pastes, and boiled beans and grains. Offering of balls, dolls, peacocks and wild fowls were also made to her.'[6]

II SOME OTHER ASPECTS OF AMMA

Since the end of the Epic period itself, various myths came to be attributed to the original character of Ammā. As Monier Williams rightly observes, 'Like Mahādeva among the male gods, his female counterpart also becomes the one great Goddess (Mahādevī) of the Śākta hierarchy, representing in her own person all other female

1. *Purap-poruṭ-venpamalai*, 3. 5.
2. *Ibid.*, 4.17.
3. *Ibid.*, 1.20.
4. Jnana Prakasar, *The Siddānta Saivism*, p.99.
5. *Paṭṭu-paddu*, Idyl I; Puram, 370-371.
6. *Silappadikāram*, XII, 21; XI. 214; cf. Jnana Prakasar, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100.

manifestations of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and absorbing all their functions. For this reason even the wives of Brahmā and Viṣṇu were said to be his daughters.'[1]

During the Epic and the Purāṇic period all the three gods of the Hindu Trinity came to be possessed of their own female counterparts, e.g. Sarasvatī, Gāyatrī, and Vāgīśvarī of Brahmā; Lakṣmī, Bhūdevī of Viṣṇu; and Umā, Gaurī, or Pārvatī of Śiva. It is worth noting that like Śiva, who had 1008 names, his Śakti also has been assigned at least one thousand distinct appellations, some expressive of her benignant, some of her ferocious character.[2]

There are many passages in the Purāṇas which deal with the all-pervading nature of the Mother Goddess. Here is a passage from the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, which describes the goddess as the source of all divine as well as cosmic evolution:

'The Gupta-rūpī Devī, that is the Devī, who is unmanifested, takes the three forms of Lakṣmī, Mahākālī, and Sarasvatī, respecting the Rājasa, the Sāttvika and the Tāmasa attributes or *Guṇas* of Prakṛti. She is also known in various other ways; for instance, at the time of Sṛṣṭi or creation, she is Mahākālī exercising control over Brahmā and bringing the world into existence at the time of the *pralaya* or universal destruction, she is Mahāmārī; as giver of wealth and prosperity she is Lakṣmī; and as destroyer of wealth and prosperity she is Alakṣmī or Jyēṣṭhādēvī.... During the time of creation, she assumes the form of a dark-coloured woman under various names, such as Mahāmāyā, Mahākālī, Mahāmārī, Kṣudhā, Tṛṣā, Nidrā, Tṛṣṇā, Ekavīrā, Kālarātri, and Duratyayā. In obedience to the command of the supreme Goddess Mahālakṣmī, she divides herself into two portions, a male portion known by the names of Nīlakaṇṭha, Raktabāhu, Śvetāṅga, Candraśekhara-Rudra, Śaṅkara, Sthāṇu, and Trilocana, and a female portion of white colour known as Vidyā, Bhāṣā, Svarā, Akṣarā, and Kāmadhenu. Similarly, the Sattva form of moon-like splendour, possessed of *akṣamālā, aṅkuśa, vīṇā and pustaka*, is also generated by Mahālakṣmī the supreme Goddess. This aspect of the goddess is known by the names of Mahāvidyā, Mahāvāṇī, Bhāratī, Vāk, Sarasvatī, Brāhmī, Kāmadhenu, Vedagarbhā, Dhī, and Īśvarī. She also gives rise to a male and a female form by the command of the Supreme Devī; the male form produced out of this aspect of the goddess is the black-coloured deity known as Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Hṛṣīkēśa, Vāsudeva and Janārdana; and the female is the fair-coloured goddess known as Umā, Gaurī, Satī, Caṇḍī, Sundarī, Subhagā and Śivā. The Rājasa form of the supreme Mahālakṣmī is simply called Lakṣmī. She carries a *Mātuluṅga* (pomegranate) fruit, the *gadā*, the *pātra* (vessel) and the *kheṭaka*; and has a mark (*cinha*) consisting of the male and female signs (*liṅga*). Her colour is of molten gold. She has also divided herself into male and female parts; the former is known as Hiraṇyagarbha, Brahmā, Vidhi, Viriñca, and Dhātā; and the latter is called Śrī, Padmā, Kamalā and Lakṣmī. And the mother of the universe, Mahālakṣmī, ordered Brahmā to take Sarasvatī as his consort. The great Brahmāṇḍa was born by their union. Rudra or Śiva married Gaurī, and they both broke open the 'egg of gold'. Lakṣmī became herself the consort of Viṣṇu and they both afforded protection of the universe. From Māyā the whole lot of created beings came into existence."[3]

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p.186.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
3. Cf. Gopinatha Rao, *E.H.I.*, Vol.I.ii,pp,334-36.

Gopinatha Rao has given in a tabular form the details of the evolution of the various cosmic gods and goddesses from the supreme Goddess Mahālakṣmī.

The Supreme Mahālakṣmī

Sattva – guṇātmikā = Sarasvatī.	Rājasa – guṇātmikā = Lakṣmī.	Tāmasa – guṇātmikā = Mahākālī.
Gaurī — Viṣṇu. *md.*	Lakṣmī — Hiraṇyagarbha. *md.*	Sarasvatī — Rudra

Gaurī — married — Rudra

The Śākta cult took different forms and shapes in different localities and provinces in India on the close of the Vedic period. The Pulindas, Śabaras, Barbaras, as well as the Kāpālikas and others, worshipped the fiercer forms of the goddess e.g. Kālī, Karālā, Caṇḍī, Cāmuṇḍā, etc. To these and especially to those goddesses said to be dwelling in the forests and the Vindhya mountain (e.g. Durgā), oblations of wine and flesh were offered. The Mother Goddess was also worshipped by the Ābhīras (e.g. Nandā or Vaśinī) the Mīnas and other tribes. The vogue of the Rādhā cult must be solely due to the working of the Ābhīras. The more popularly worshipped goddesses are the milder forms of Pārvatī or Umā, or those of the different manifestations of Lakṣmī, etc.

Another phase of the cult is that of Śakti or Force. 'The powers of willing, setting, creating, illuding, etc. were conceived of as goddesses, as the noun Śakti is of feminine gender' (cf. *infra*). The Śāktas mainly worship the Goddess in the form of *Ānandabhairavī*, *Tripurasundarī* or *Lalitā*.

Monier Williams points out that the personifications, following the analogy of Viṣṇu's incarnations, are sometimes grouped according to a supposed difference of participation in the Divine energy, such for example as the full energy (*pūrṇā Śakti*), the partial (aṁśa-rūpiṇī), the still more partial (kalāṁśa-rūpiṇī), this last including mortal women in various degrees, from Brāhmin women downwards, who are all worshipped as forms of the divine mother manifesting herself upon earth.[1]

The Purāṇas and the Āgamas generally describe the various goddesses as follows :

Pārvatī (also called as Satī, Umā, Śaivī, etc.), Durgā, the nine Durgās (Navadurgās : cf. infra), Mahiṣāsuramardinī, Kātyāyanī, Nandā, Bhadrakālī, Mahākālī, Ambā, Ambikā, Maṅgalā, Sarva-maṅgalā, Kālārī, Kālarātrī (who is seated on an ass), Lalitā, Gaurī (represented as an unmarried girl), Rambhā, Toṭalā, Tripurā, Bhūtamātā, Yoganidrā, Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, Raudrī, Kāla-vikarṇikā, Balavikarṇikā, Balapramathanī, Sarvabhūta-damanī, Manonmanī, Vāruṇī, Cāmuṇḍā, Rakta-Cāmuṇḍā, Śivadūtī, Yogeśarī, Bhairavī, Tripura-bhairavī, Kīrti, Siddhi, Ṛddhi, Kṣamā, Dīpti, Rati, Śvetā, Bhadrā, Jayā and Vijayā, Kālī, Ghaṇṭākarṇī, Jayantī, Diti, Arundhatī,

1. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

Aparājitā, Surabhi, Kṛṣṇā, Indrākṣī, Annapūrṇā, Tulasī-devī, Aśvārūḍhā-devī, Bhuvaneśwarī, Bālā, Rājamātaṅgī; the consort of Viṣṇu, namely, Lakṣmī, Bhūmi or Bhūdevī; Sarasvatī of Brahmā, and further the seven Mātṛkās, Jyeṣṭhā-devī, etc.

Birth of various Goddesses

The Purāṇas deal with the problem of the birth of various goddesses. It is often described that 'Satī, the daughter of Dakṣa, was the first wife of Śiva. Dakṣa is said have once decided to perform a great sacrifice, and he neither invited his son-in-law nor his daughter. Satī, inspite of the warning of Śiva went to her father's where she was treated rather disrespectfully. On account of this she preferred 'not to outlive the insult', and perished by fire. Being greatly enraged at this, Śiva, disturbed the sacrifice and cut off the head of Dakṣa. Afterwards, Satī was reborn as Umā, the daughter of Himavat and Menā.[1] The *Rāmāyaṇa* narrates that Gaṅgā and Umā were the two daughters of this pair.[2] The *Harivaṁśa* states that there were three daughters e.g. (Umā or Aparṇā), Ēkaparṇā, and Ēkapāṭalā.[3] The word Umā is variously derived e.g. from, '*U-mā* 'O do not'. Weber offers another derivation e.g. from the Sanskrit root *u, av*, to protect.[4] Oppert gives an interesting derivation. He says that, 'the word is nothing but a slight variation of the ancient Gauḍa-Dravidian word Ammā, mother, which has been admitted into the Sanskrit language as Ambā (Ambikā). Strangely enough the form Ummā or Umā for Ammā is still in actual use. It is in existence in such popular names as *Ummaṇṇā*, which stands for Ammaṇṇā, and occurs in the regimental lists of the Madras Army."[5]

Lakṣmī, the consort of Viṣṇu, is said to have been born in the act of churning of the ocean. The Purāṇas also narrate many stories in regard to the origin of the various names of the goddesses e.g. Pārvatī was originally Kālī (black) but after practising penance she became Gaurī, Hiraṇmayī, etc.

The Nine Durgas

The most important institution of the Mother Goddess is that of the nine Durgās. Various lists are given in regard to the names of the goddesses. The Āgamas mention them as follows: Śaila-putrī, Brahmacāriṇī, Caṇḍā, Skandamātā, Kūṣmāṇḍī-Durgā, Kātyāyanī, Kālarātrī, Mahā-Gaurī and Siddha-dāyinī. Gopinatha Rao has given the following names: Nīlakaṇṭhī, Kṣemaṅkarī, Harasiddhi, Rudrāṁśa-durgā, Vana-durgā, Agni-durgā, Jaya-durgā, Vindhyavāsinī-durgā and Ripumārī-durgā.[6] The *Kāraṇāgama*, while quoting the *Skandayāmala* describes the nine Durgās as: Rudracaṇḍā, Caṇḍogrā, Caṇḍa-nāyikā, Caṇḍā, Caṇḍavatī, Caṇḍarūpā, Aticaṇḍikā and Ugra-Caṇḍikā. The *Bhaviṣya* P. describes them as: Mahālakṣmī, Nandā, Kṣemaṅkarī, Śivadūtī, Mahārūdrā, Bhramarī, Caṇḍa-maṅgalā, Revatī and Harasiddhi.[7]

---

1. Cf. under Siva: *Dakṣa's story*.
2. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I, 36, 15.
3. *Harivaṁśa*, XIII, 13–20.
4. Quoted in Muir, *O.S.T.*, Vol. IV, p. 425; cf. also Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. II, pp. 168 seq.
5. Oppert, *op. cit.*, p. 421.
6. Cf. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, I, ii, pp. 345 ff; 356–7.
7. *Bhaviṣya P.* 4, 61, 9; cf. also under *Ritual*.

The Mahavidyas

The Mahāvidyās which are the sources of the goddess's highest knowledge are described to be ten in number, the number being probably selected to match the ten chief incarnations of Viṣṇu.[1] They are as follows: Kālī (sometimes called Śyāmā, black in colour, fierce and irascible in character. (2) Tārā, a more benign manifestation, worshipped especially in Kashmir. (3) Ṣoḍaśī, a beautiful girl of sixteen (also called Tripurā, worshipped in Malabar). (4) Bhuvaneśvarī. (5) Bhairavī. (6) Cchinna-mastakā, a naked goddess holding in one hand a blood-stained scimitar and in the other her own severed head, which drinks the water-blood gushing from her headless trunk. (7) Dhūmavatī. (8) Vagaḷā or Bagaḷāmukhī. (9) Mātaṅgī, a woman of the Bhaṅgī caste. (10) Kamalātmikā or Kamalā. Of these the first two are especially Mahāvidyās, the next five Vidyās, and the last three Siddha-vidyās.[2]

The Matrs, Matrkas or Mahamatrs

The institution of the Mothers (Mātṛs, Mātṛkās or Mahamātṛs) is very interesting. The number of the Mātṛs enumerated is seven, eight, nine and fourteen. The names of Brāhmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, and Aindrī are almost common to all the lists. The *Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi* and the *Mārkaṇḍeya P.* designate the seventh as Nārasiṁhī. Kṣīrasvāmin and the Suprabhedāgama, Nirṇayasindhu, Rūpāvatāra, Śrītattvanidhi and some other works give the following names of the eighth mother: Kālasaṅkarṣaṇī, Vāmanī, Vaināyakī, Mahālakṣmī, and Caṇḍikā respectively.[3] The *Varāha* P. describes the eight mātṛs as: Yogīśvarī, Maheśvarī, Vaiṣṇavī, Brāmhi-Svayambhu, Kaumārī, Indrajā, Yamadaṇḍahārī, Anasūyā, and Varāhā.[4] The *Brahmāṇḍa* P. adds Mahālakṣmī as the eighth mother.[5] Some lists give nine names: Nārasiṁhī, Cāmuṇḍā, Vārāhī, Vāruṇī, Lakṣmī, Kālī, Kāpālī, Kurukulyā, and Indrāṇī.[6] The *Skānda* P. gives the names of fourteen goddesses: Siddhāmbikā, Kroḍamātā, Kāpālī, Tārā, Suvarṇā, Trilokajetrī, Bhāneśvarī, Carcikā, Ekavīrā, Yogeśvarī, Caṇḍikā, Traipurā, Bhūtāmbikā, and Harasiddhi.

The Purāṇas and the Āgamas give various stories in regard to the birth of the Mātṛkās. The *Suprabhedāgama* relates that the seven Mātṛkās were created by Brahmā for the purpose of killing Nirṛta.[8] The *Mārkaṇḍeya* P. narrates that these were born from Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Skanda and Indra, just at the time of killing Śumbha and Niśumbha, or Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa.[9] We need not, however, enter into the deails of these myths. The Cālukyas called the seven Mothers as their protectresses. The Yādavas of Deogiri had Nārasiṁhī as their Kuladevatā. The Odeyars of Mysore still worship the Goddess Cāmuṇḍī.[10] In our opinion, the number of the Divine Mothers seems to have been originally eight representing the counterparts of the eight forms of Śiva. But later on, as the number seven became popular among the Brāhmins, the original number was changed into seven. The institution of the sisters or

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 187.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 187–88.
3. Khare, *Mūrti-vijñāna*, p. 186.
4. *Varāha P.*, Adh. 26.
5. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 44,11–12.
6. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, P. 188 fn.
7. *Skānda*, *Kaumārikā-khaṇḍa*, 66, 53–54.
8. Gopinatha Rao, *E.H.I*, I. ii, pp. 382–83.
9. *Ibid.*, 379 ff.
10. Cf. under *Gaṇapati*.

Kanniyārs in Southern India seems to be an imitation of the institution of Mātṛkās. The seven goddesses of the Bhoyis are described as Dartu, Kudra, Kudri, Dang, Pacheria, Haserwar, and Pakali Kudrasini.[1].

The Yoginis This is another 'important class of manifestations of the Mother Goddess. 'These are sometimes represented as eight fairies or sorceresses created by and attendant on Durgā, sometimes as mere forms of that Goddess, sixty or sixty-five in number, and capable of being multiplied to the number of ten millions.[2] The *Skānda P.* describes that there are as many Yoginīs as there are Gotras (one for each Gotra). They, who are also designated as Kuladevatās, are as follows: Śrī-Mātā, Tāraṇī, Āśāpurī, Gotrapā, Icchārtināśinī, Pippalī, Vikāravaśā, Jagan-mātā, Mahāmātā, Siddhā, Bhaṭṭārikā, Karambā, Vikārā, Mīṭhā, Suparṇā, Vasujā, Mātaṅgī, Mahādēvī, Vāṇī, Mukuṭēśvarī, Bhadrā, Mahāśakti, Saṁhārī, Mahābalā and Cāmuṇḍā.

Lokamataras The twenty-four daughters of Dakṣa are sometimes designated as Lokamātaras.[4]

Saktis Some of the Purāṇas enumerate the eight Śaktis e.g. Dīptī, Sūkṣmā, Jayī, Bhadrā, Vibhūti, Vimalā, Amoghā, and Vidyutā.

Nayikas The other class of manifestations are called the Nāyikās or mistresses. These are not necessarily mothers. ' In fact no other idea is connected with them than that of illegitimate sexual love. They are called as Balinī, Kāmēśvarī, Aruṇā, Medinī, Jayinī, Sarveśvarī, and Kaulēśī.' [6]

Other manifestations Further there are the other manifestations of the Goddess e.g. Śākinīs, Ḍākinīs, etc. who are said to have arisen from the *Atharvaveda.* The *Skānda P.* describes the six divisions of these: Śākinī, Ḍākinī, Kākinī, Hākinī, Ekinī, and Labhinī.[7] We shall discuss the problem in detail under ritual.

The Mother Goddess and the Demons

The Mother Goddess, through her different manifestations, is described to have killed various demons e.g. Bhaṇḍāsura,[8] Huṇḍa, Kaliṅgadānava, Mahiṣāsura,[9] Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa,[10] Durga or Durgama,[11] Sunda, Upasunda, Niśumbha, Ruru and other Rākṣasas. The following account from the *Mārkaṇḍeya P.* will elucidate the point:[12] 'It is said that the Goddess that killed the buffalo-demon was made up of the fierce radiance of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmadeva, and all the Gods contributed to the formation of her limbs as well as her ornaments. She is called Caṇḍī or Ambikā. The

1. Risley, *Tribes and Castes in Bengal*, I, pp. 80-81.
2. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
3. *Skānda P. Brahma-khaṇḍa, Dharmāraṇya-khaṇḍa*, 9, 106.
4. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Pūrvabhāga*, 9, 47.
5. *Bhaviṣya P.* 1, 201, 11.
6. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 188.
7. *Skānda P, Brahmakhaṇḍa, Dharmāraṇyakhaṇḍa*, 20, 7-8.
8. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 16.
9. *Mārkaṇḍeya P*, Adh 82.
10. *Ibid*, 85,4ff.
11. *Devī-Bhāgavata, Seventh Sk.*Adh.28.
12. Cf. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.*, pp. 204-5.

formation of the Goddess that killed Śumbha and Niśumbha is thus explained. The gods being oppressed by the demons Śumbha and Niśumbha, went to the Himālayas and praised the Goddess, whereupon Pārvatī came out to bathe in the Ganges. Then Śivā, also called Ambikā, came out of the body of Pārvatī, and said that it was she whom the gods were praising to induce her to kill Śumbha and Niśumbha. She was called Kauśikī, because she sprang out from Kośa or frame of Pārvatī's body. When Ambikā came out of her body, Pārvatī's complexion became dark, and hence she received the name Kālikā (dark one). In the course of the fight, when Śumbha and Niśumbha pounced upon her, her forehead became dark with anger, and from it came Kālī with a frightful face wearing a garland of skulls and tiger-skin and with an infernal weapon (Khaṭvāṅga) in her hand, she killed the demons Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa, and was back again to Ambikā, who thereupon, since she had killed those demons, gave her the name Cāmuṇḍā. The seven Śaktis, Brāhmī, Maheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Nārasiṁhī and Aindrī, which are the powers or spirits of the gods from whom their names are derived, are called her excellent forms (Vibhūti). At the end, the Goddess says that she would in the Vaivasvata Manu, destroy Śumbha and Niśumbha again by assuming the form of the Goddess residing on the Vindhya mountain, and proceeds to give the other forms that she would assume on other occasions such as the daughter of Nanda, Śākambharī, Bhīmā, Bhrāmarī, etc.

Kālī: The Fierce Goddess

We cannot, however, end this brief survey without expressing a word about Kālī, a Goddess who is worshipped by thousands of Indians to-day. This four-armed Goddess always thirsts for blood, preferably that of human beings. She seems to be the same goddess as that of the Vāhīkas. 'She is garlanded with heads of demons, gorged in blood, with skulls about her blood-besmeared throat, having dead bodies for ear-rings, carrying two dead bodies in her hands, and inhabitant of buring grounds (for the dead).' The Yoginī Tantra gives a very graphic description of the Goddess :

'She is crane-like (i. e. white), with rows of teeth resplendent as the beauty of lightning, having the effulgence of a smooth new cloud sprung up in the rainy season, charming with rows of skull-necklaces, with flowing hair...with lolling tongue, with dreadful voice, with three eyes all red, having the circle of mouth oozing (or glittering) with crores and crores of moons,...with two corpses as ear-ornaments, bedecked with various gems,...girdled with thousands of dead men's hands, with smiling face, whose countenance is flecked with streams of blood dripping from the corners of her mouth, whose four arms are adorned with sword, severed hands, boons and security; with great teeth,...with blood-bedecked body, mounting upon the corpse of Śiva,...having her left foot set upon the corpse.' [1]

She is always described in the Tantras and the Purāṇas as withdrawing all things unto herself at and by the dissolution of the universe.

III THE GRAMA-DEVATAS

The cult of the Mother Goddess has spread in every nook and corner of India, a fact which can be very well perceived from the various representations of the Mother-Goddess in the form of Grāma-devatās. We may just point out an instance or two

1. Cf. Payne, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

which show how the tradition of the village goddess is directly connected with that of Ammā, the Mother Goddess. Like the proto-Indian deities, we find that some of the representations of Ayanār and Muttyālammā have the horned headgear placed over their head.[1] Besides, the main cult of these grāma-devatās consists of many pre-Āryan elements.

Their Description

The Grāmadevatā is the 'tutelary deity' or 'protecting mother' of a particular place or locality in India. The Grāmadevatās present one or the other capacity of the Śakti. Especially in Southern India the cult of these goddesses is very popular, and there is almost no village without the shrine of the *Grāmadevatā*.

The *Grāmadevatā-pratiṣṭhā* describes that, 'Vaiṣṇava people worship the goddess in the centre of the hamlet, Śāktas do outside it, Kāpālikas on the burning ground, Gāṇapatas at the house-door or at the house-pillar, and others with the exception of the merchants revere her in the bazaar street. All, however, can adore her near a waterside, in a forest, or in a stone, wooden or clay temple.'[2] The *Smṛti-Purāṇa-samuccaya* mentions that, 'the Grāmadevatās are found in hamlets of low caste people, in the abodes of savages and in the villages of peasants, in the tents of the Ābhīras, in the station of hunters, in the flocks of outcasts and in bazaars, among the Śūdras and cutivators, in capitals, towns, villages and sub-villages, in carpenters' shops, on the roads, in the houses of village servants, in the abodes of Vilomas, as well as in the huts of Pulkasas, and in the houses of weavers.'[3] The shrines of the village goddesses generally consist of large or small buildings, or of rough stones with or without carvings on them, under trees or within groves, or of a spear or a trident fixed up in some locality to represent the goddess. Monier Williams states that, 'there are about one hundred and forty distinct Mothers in Gujarat, besides numerous varieties of some of the more popular forms. Some of the names may be cited: Khodīyar, Becarāji, Uṇṭāī, Marakī (popularly Markī) causing cholera; Haḍakāi; Āśāpurā, Kalkā, Hingrāj, etc.'[4] The more popular names of the goddesses in Southern India may be mentioned as under:

Kollāpurī-ammā, Huskūr-ammā, the seven Kanniyamār, Bhadrakālī, Kāliy-ammā, Mariyammā, Muttyālammā, Ponnammā, Ellammā, Ankālammā, Kolumammā, Selliyammā, Puttālammā, Vandi-Kāliyammā, Alagiyanacchiyammā, Ulegāttāl, Pidārī, Pechi, Kātteri, Polerammā, Gangammā, Chauḍammā, Durgammā, Nūkal-ammā, Paidammā, Āsirammā, Pādālammā, Gaṇṭyālammā, Paradesammā, Neral-ammā, Mallammā, Peddintammā, Somālammā, Mātangirālā, Talupulammā, Sellāndiyammā, etc.[5]

The names of these goddesses are partly taken from the Purāṇas (like Mari-yammā = Mārikā), partly from the Tantras (Mātangirāla = Mātangī), and other works. The names like Kāliyammā and others are the exact equivalents of the Sanskrit

1. Cf. p. 45. *(supra)*.
2. Cf. Oppert, *The Original Inhabitants of India*, p. 459.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Monir Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 225.
5. Krishna Sastri, *South Indian Images*, pp. 223–4.

words like Kālī, *etc.* Some of them are mere translations *e. g.* Kolumammā or Kulamāyammā, Saliyammā (Tsallammā of the Telugus) and Sellandiyammā, or Polerammā are equivalent with the goddess Sitalā. As these goddesses are mainly meant to scare away demons and diseases, new words are coined *i.e.* Plague-ammā, Goddess who would do away with the plague. There is also another way of solution, namely, the names occurring in the Purāṇas and Tantras may themselves be mere Sanskritized forms of the original Dravidian expressions which were current among the inhabitants of India.

Their Symbols

Whitehead has given an interesting account regarding the cult of the village goddesses in India. The images or symbols representing these are equally varied. They may be represented as [1]:

(1) In primitive villages : a clay figure, or a stone pillar standing in a field, or a carving in a stone-platform under a tree, or in a small enclosure surrounded by a stone wall, or small conical stones, blackened with the annointing oil ;

(2) a slab of stone having the figure of a woman roughly carved on it ;

(3) a brass-pot filled with water and decorated with margossa leaves (*Melia Azadirachta*) as in the case of Kāliyammā at Shiyāli ; or as in other Tāmil villages, an earthenware pot filled with water and decorated with margossa leaves :

(4) seven brass pots (representing perhaps the seven sisters or virgins), without any water in them, one of the other, with margossa leaves' stick into the mouth of the topmost pot, as well as by an earthenware pot filled with water and also adorned with margossa leaves ;

(5) a curious symbol called *Āratī* used in Mysore, consisting of a lamp made of rice-flour about six or eight inches high, with the image of a face roughly represented on one side of it by pieces of silver and blotches of Kunkuma, red paste stuck on to represent the eyes, nose, mouth, *etc* ; and sticks of incense stuck in the lamp all round, there being on the top four betel leaves stuck upright and forming a sort of cup with a wreath of white flowers below them ; or lastly,

(6) a common symbol of the village deities being simply a stick or a spear.

'Every village in South India is believed by the people to be surrounded by evil spirits, who are always on the watch to inflict diseases and misfortunes of all kinds on the unhappy villagers. It is also commonly believed that they lurk everywhere, on the tops of palmyra trees, in caves and rocks, in ravines and chasms, fly in the air, like birds of prey, ready to pounce down upon any unprotected victim, and the Indian villagers pass through life in constant dread of these invisible enemies. Eventually the poor turn towards these Goddesses for protection, whose evil spirits and epidemics of cholera, small-pox, or fever, cattle disease, failure of crops, childlessness, fires, and all the manifold ills that flesh is heir to in an Indian village'.[2]

1. Whitehead, *Village Gods of South India*, pp. 34 ff.
2. *Ibid*, pp. 43–44.

The village goddesses have a peculiar attraction in the eyes of the respective village folk, and they are popularly worshipped in case of any earthly calamity or epidemics occurring in the country.

IV. THE SAKTA SECTS AND DEVOTEES

(a) *The Śākta Sects*

Śāktism has become a very popular religion today. Western scholars generally used to divide the Śākta worshippers into two classes: The Right-hand (Dakṣiṇācāra) and the Left-hand (Vāmācāra) Śāktas. Bhattacarya, for the first time, made a distinction between the Vāmācāris and the Kaulas.[1] The Vāmācāris are condemned for their most obscene and immoral practice of the Cakra-pūjā and other rites. Barth calls them as hypocrites and debauchees.[2] Even Avalon speaks of the decadence of the followers of the Vāmācāra community. Payne, however, observes that, 'the term left-hand used by worshippers of the Goddess, is not of abuse as may seem to have been supposed. Nor are these names used after the manner of Martin Luther, who, attaching both the life of the world and the life of the cloister, described the one as *dectralis impius* and the other as *sinistralis impius*.'[3]

Some scholars are of opinion that the sect of the Dakṣiṇācāris must have come into being after the giving up of human sacrifice, and later even of animal sacrifice. Payne states that 'there is a tradition which connects the giving up of human sacrifice at the Devī's temple at Conjeeveram with the great Hindu philosopher and controversialist Śaṅkarācārya, and that slowly a reformed type of Devī worship spread.[4] But the evidence of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Cchāndogya Upaniṣad* (which refers to the cult of the Vāmadevavratins)[5] is enough to prove that both the sects must have come into vogue long before the period of Śaṅkarācārya.

Mainly basing his conclusion on the *Kulārṇava* and the *Jñānadīpa Tantras*, Woodroffe states that men may be divided into three classes[6];

(1) *Paśus*: Those akin to animals, in whom *tamas* predominates.
(2) *Vīras*: Heroes in whom *Rajas* is the chief quality.
(3) *Divyas*: Divine beings in whom *Sattva* is predominant.

Savasadhana

The aim of the worshipper is to attain the Divya class. The procedure is difficult indeed, as can be seen from what is said by Rāmakṛṣṇa about it: Two persons, it is said, began together the rite of invoking the Goddess Kālī by the terrible process called Śavasādhana. One invoker was frightened to insanity by the horrors of the earlier portion of the night; the other was favoured by the vision of the Divine Mother at the end of the night. Then he asked her, "Mother! Why did the other man become mad?" The Deity answered, "Thou, too, O child! didst become mad many times in thy various previous births, and now at last thou seest me."[7]

---

1. Bhattacarya, *Hindu Castes and Sects*, pp. 407-13.
2. Barth, *The Religions of India*, p. 204.
3. Payne, *The Sāktas*, p. 24.
4. *Ibid*, p. 25.
5. *Cchāndogya Upaniṣad*, II, 13, 1-2.
6. Woodroffe, *Sakti and Sākta*, p. 78 f.
7. Max Müller, *Life and Sayings of Rāmakṛṣṇa*, No. 387, p. 185.

Payne has given a concise account of the different stages of preparation through which a Paśu has to pass. We have summarized the main results in the footnote below.[1]

It is worth noting that there were different forms of Kaula worship. Lakṣmīdhara in his commentary on the *Saundaryalaharī* speaks with severe condemnation of some of the practices of what he calls the Uttara or Northern Kaulas.[2] Bhattacarya calls them as being most extreme in their practices.[3] Eggeling makes

1. A (or generally Dakṣiṇācāra).
   1. *Veda*. The Sādhaka must carry out the prescriptions of the Veda. Fish and meat should not be eaten on certain days. Co-habitation with one's wife must be carefully regulated. The worship is largely of an external character. This has been described as the Path of Action (Kriyā-mārga). It is admitted that many of the Vedic rites cannot now be performed, and even a Paśu must therefore attend to the Āgamic ritual in this Kali age.
   2. *Vaiṣṇava*. The injunctions of the Veda are still followed. Viṣṇu is worshipped. It is distinguished from the earlier stage by the endurance of great austerities *tapas*), and by the contemplation of the Supreme everywhere. It is the path of devotion (Bhakti-mārga).
   3. *Śavia* Meditation is now on Siva. This is the militant (Kṣatriya) stage. To love and mercy are added strenuous effort and the cultivation of power. Entrance is made on the path of Knowledge (Jñāna-mārga).
   4. *Dakṣiṇa*. This is the final preparation for passing out of the Paśu state. Meditation is of the Devī. Certain rituals are performed at night Magic power (siddhi) is obtained by the use of a rosary of human bone. If Pañcatattva worship takes place, it is only performed with substitutes for the five elements.

   B. 5. *Vāma*. Details of this path are kept secret because revelation destroys the Siddhi attained hereby. The help of a spiritual director (Guru) is throughout necessary. Passion, which has hitherto run 'downwards and outwards,' is now directed 'upwards and inwards,' and transformed into power. The bond which makes a man Paśu have gradually to be cut away: for example, pity ignorance, fear, shame, family convention' and caste. There is worship with Pañcatattva at night.

   6. *Siddhānta*. This is superior to the previous stage, because the Sādhaka shows knowledge, freedom from fear of the Paśu, adherence to the truth ; and performs Pañcatattva worship openly. 'Siddhavīras were allowed special liberties with women (Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 354).

   7-6. *Aghora and Yoga*. They are not always divided into separate paths. The Aghoras were ascetics who despised everything earthly, and ate human flesh and excrement.

   C. 9. *Kaula*. One can now become a Divya. Knowledge of this path unites one with Devī and Siva. Every Dharma is lost in the greatness of Kuladharma. There are no injunctions, no prohibitions, no restrictions as to time and place, and no rules at all. One is beyond good and evil, and may indulge in practices which the general body of Hindus regarded unlawful. This is the Svecchācāra stage. 'At heart a Sākta, outwardly a Saiva, in gatherings a Vaiṣṇava, in thus many a guise the Kaulas wander on earth. The Kaula or Kulina is one 'who sees the imperishable and all-pervading self in all things, and all things in the self.

2. Cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, XIII, p. 511.
3. Bhattacarya, *op. cit.*, pp. 407-13.

an equally strong observation regarding the customs of the Kaulas as 'probably the most degrading ever practised under the pretext of religious worship.'[1] The *Karpūra-mañjarī* of Rājaśekhara (c. 900) also refers to the doings of a Kaula magician.[2]

(b) *Śākta Devotees in the Purāṇas.*

We have already observed how Śāktism has become a popular cult amongst the Indians. It is, however, proposed to deal here with the problem of the Śākta devotees described in the Purāṇas.

The Purāṇas have given some details in regard to the worshippers of the Mother Goddess. It is proposed to give here a short survey of the same:

The wife of Jayatsena, king of Kāśī, was a worshipper of Gaurī.[3] Śūdraka was a devotee of the Devī (Goddess).[4] It is described that Sudarśana of Śṛṅgaverapura regained his kingdom by performing the *Vāg-bīja-mantra* and adoring Jagadambā.[5] The story of Suratha as a worshipper of the Goddess is detailed in the *Devī-Bhāgavata* and *Brahmavaivarta* and other *Purāṇas.*[6] King Dēvapanna is said have been a worshipper of Cāmuṇḍā.[7] King Nahusa is described to have worshipped the goddess on the seventh day of the bright half of the month of Bhādrapada.[8] Aja and Raghu worshipped Bhairavī.[9] Mahānandī worshipped Mahālakṣmī at Magadha.[10] King Naraka was a keen devotee of Kāmākhyā.[11] King Rūpasena of Vardhananagara and his wife offered their son as a victim in a sacrifice; but he was revived again.[12] Patañjalī is said to have defeated Kali with the help of the blessings of the Goddess."[13] Further the following are described as being the worshippers of the Mother-Goddess; King Satyavrata of the Ikṣvāku dynasty,[14] Yājñavalkya,[15] Dharmadhvaja,[16] Sumada (worshipper of Kāmākṣī),[17] Kārttavīrya, who possessed the Kavaca of Bhadrakālī, and others.[18]

V. ORIGIN OF SAKTISM

The Mohenjo Daro discoveries have made it pretty clear that the origin of the Mother Goddess can be traced to the pre-Vedic period. But surprisingly enough the very fact that all the references in regard to the Mother Goddess occur in the Aryan writings of the later period, has given sufficient scope for diversity of opinion amongst scholars.

J. N. Bhattacarya maintains, "To me it seems that the Tāntric cult was invented partly to justify the habit of drinking, which prevailed among the Brāhmans

1. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, XIII, p 511.
2. Cf. Payne, *op. cit.*, p 30; also S. Laxman's Transl. of *Rājataraṅgiṇī.*
3. *Skānda P.* 6 *Nāgarakhaṇḍa*, 177, 16.
4. *Skānda, Kaumārikākhaṇḍa* (2), Adh.40.
5. *Devī-Bhāgavata*, 3 Adh. 15, 16.
6. *Ibid*, 5, Adh. 32, 35; *Brahmavaivarta, Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, I, 151 ff; *Siva P., Umā-saṃhitā*. 5, Adh, 451, 14 ff.
7. *Skānda P.* 5, 3, Adh. 169, v. 5.
8. *Bhavisya*, 4, 46. 7 ff,
9. *Skānda, Prabhāsakṣetra Mā.*, 58, 29 ff.
10. *Bhavisya*, 3, 2, 3, 34.
11. *Kālikā P.* 39, 163 ff.
12. *Bhavisya*, 3 1, 3 ff.
13. *Bhavisya*, 3, 2, 35. 1 ff.
14. *Devī-Bhāgavata*, 7, Adh. 11, 12.
15. *Ibid*, 9, 5, 1 ff.
16. *Ibid*, 9, Adh. 15 ff,
17. *Padma P., Pātālakhaṇḍa*, 1256.
18. *Brahmavaivarta, Gaṇēśakhaṇḍa*, 36,42.

even after the prohibition of it by our great law-givers, but chiefly to enable the Brāhmanical courtiers of the beastly kings to compete with the secular courtiers in the struggle of becoming favourites, and causing the ruin of their royal masters."[1] Hauer has 'shown how close are the parallels between some of the old sacrifices, like those of the *Mahāvrata* and many of the ceremonies which repel us in the Tantras.[2] Starbruck points out that, 'The Vedas were written before and during the period when the Aryans were conquering the aborigines of India and were engaged in feuds among their own tribes. Under such conditions there are no goddesses, although the literature is richly polytheistic. When the nation settled down into a relatively peaceful life and agricultural pursuits, the worship of female deities has risen to a place of supreme importance; Durgā, the eternity; Sarasvatī, supreme wisdom; and Śakti, mother of all phenomena[3].' Mackenzie advocates an Asiatic origin. He says, 'We are told that a revolution in the Hindu pantheon took place during the Brahmanic age as a result of the rise of the 'middle kingdom', which was inhabited by a group known as the Bharatas, who worshipped Bhāratī, a goddess not unlike the mother-goddess of Egypt and early Europe; that this goddess became associated with Sarasvatī and was ultimately recognised as the wife of Brahmā, the Supreme God; that when Buddhism declined and Śiva became the most popular deity, this goddess worship was transferred to his consort and was organized into a separate sect."[4] Scholars like Vincent Smith[5] and Elliot[6] have held that the migrations of the nomad nations of the central Asian steppes, which culminated in the Kushan or Indo-Scythian conquest in Northern India, must have caused this change in Hinduism. Slater maintained that 'While the Dravidians were Aryanized in language, the Āryans were Dravidianized in culture.'[7] In regard to the peculiarly common characteristic of the village goddesses and the Aryan goddesses, he says that, 'We can hardly refrain from identifying her with Kālī, with the rounded limbs, wide hips, swelling breasts, exaggerated waist, and with many arms brandishing weapons, tirelessly dancing, a fit emblem indeed for Nature as is in India, so bountiful in her kindly moods, so deadly when the whim takes her.' He also believes that the cult of the Mother Goddess must have arisen first among the matriarchal tribes.[8] Sen points out the close connection between Caṇḍī with her lions and the Cretan goddesses.[9] Barth traces the roots of Śāktism 'far away in those ideas, as old as India herself, of a sexual dualism, placed at the beginning of things (in a Brāhmaṇa of the *Yajurveda*, for example, Prajāpati is androgynous), or of a common womb, in which beings are formed, which is also their common tomb.'[10] Recently N. Venkataramanayya, having drawn some comparisons between Durgā and the Goddess Ishtar and Anahita, points out that, 'The Mother Goddess entered India in the company of the Vedic Gods, from the far distant regions in the

1. Bhattacarya, *Hindu Castes and Sects*, p. 413; Cf. also Payne, *The Saktas*.
2. J. W. Hauer, *Der Vratya*; Payne, *The Sāktas*, p. 63.
3. Starbruck, 'Female Principle', *E.R.E.*, V 828.
4. Mackenzie, *Indian Myth and Legend*, p. XXXIX.
5. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, p. 9.
6. Elliot, *op. cit.*, II. p. 276.
7. Slater, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
8. *Ibid*, pp. 91–92, 103.
9. Sen, *H. B. L. L.*, p. 297.
10. Barth, *Religions of India*, p. 207.

west of Asia, namely, Egypt, Nineveh, and Babylon.'[1] Marshall observes that the cult of the Mother Goddess must have originated in Anatolia (probably in Phrygia) and spread thence throughout the Western Asia.[2]

However, the Mohenjo Daro discoveries have supplied us with the most important clue, namely, that the Indus Valley civilization is absolutely non-Aryan in nature. It is also significant to note that both the inscriptions and the representations on the seals are silent in regard to the main features of the goddess. Hence the few changes that are made in the case of Ishtar, *e.g.* her close association with the lion, *etc.* seem to be of a later date.

It is also worth noting that the *Mahābhārata*, while dealing with the cult of the Vrātyas,[3] who are otherwise called Vāhīkas, speaks of the worship of the female demon, of the singing of youthful women and of the sacrificing of animals on the occasion. This clearly proves beyond doubt that the cult of the Mother Goddess must have arisen in this land alone, wherein once the Mohenjo Daro civilization flourished. It is just possible that immediately afterwards, the cult must have spread far and wide in the whole of India. And eventually numerous additions and modifications in the cult must have been effected by the people of different provinces–so as to suit their taste and inclinations. In view of the above observations, one can very easily perceive how with the exception of Slater and partly of Barth, all the other scholars have not arrived at a proper solution of the above problem.

VI. THE TANTRAS

The Tantras—Date—Contents—Their abuses and disabuses—Main Works.

The main literature of the Śāktas consists of the Tantras or Tāntric texts. In fact like the other scientific religious works, namely, the Nigamas, Āgamas, Yāmalas, Dāmaras, Uḍḍīśas, Kakṣapūtas, and others in the case of other systems, the Tantras form the main religious expositions of the Śāktas. The *Devi-Bhāgavata* calls the Tantraśāstra as a Vedāṅga. The *Tārāpradīpa* enjoins that in the Kaliyuga the Tāntric rites alone –as against the Vedic, are prescribed.

The expression Tantra, which is derived from the root 'tan,' 'to spread,' by the addition of the suffix 'tran,'[4] conveys various meanings—'starting from that of web or warp, it came gradually to stand for an uninterrupted series, orderly ritual, the doctrinal theory or system itself, and finally its literary exposition[5], or in the words of Woodroffe, 'injunction (Vidhi), regulation (Niyama), and Śāstra (treatise).'[6]

The word Tantra was also employed in the case of other scientific treatises also *e.g.* the *Pañcatantra*, *Kātantra* (a Sanskrit Grammar) of Śarvavarman, the *Tantravārttika*, the *Tantraratna* (c. 1300), the *Tantrasāra* by Mādhava (1199-1278 A.D.), the *Tantrāloka* by Abhinavagupta, *etc.* But now the word generally connotes a Śākta Āgama alone.

---

1. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra-Śiva*, p. 58.
2. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 50.
3. Cf. under the *Vrātyas*.
4. Cf Woodroffe, *Śakti and Śākta*, p. 50.
5. Payne, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
6. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

The extant works give different lists in regard to the number of Tantras. They are considered to be sixty-four generally. But the *Āgamavilāsa* adds a list of eighty-three again. The *Matisiddhānta-Tantra* (c. 18th cen. A. D.) divides them into three sections, corresponding to the three divisions of India. The first group consists of the Tantras of the region of Viṣṇukrānta (from the Vindhya mountains to Chittagong), the second of Rathakrānta (from the Vindhya mountains to China (Northern India), and thirdly those of the region of Aśvakrānta (the rest of India).[1] The Macdonald Manuscripts, on the other hand, detail a list of sixty-four titles. The author says, 'besides these there are a hundred other Tantras.' The *Vārāhi-Tantra* adds a list of sixty-two more. The Buddhists mention seventy-two works of their own. Ward has given a separate list of his own.[2]

Number of Tantras

The Tantra is not mentioned in the *Amarakōśa*. Moreover, the Chinese pilgrims, who visited India between 400 and 700 A. D., do not refer to the Tantras.[3] Avalon takes them to a considerably earlier date and even assumes for them the antiquity of the Vedas. Farquhar proposes that the Tantras seem to have taken a definite shape only after the 7th century A. D.[4] But the discovery of a manuscript of the *Kubjikā-Tantra* written in Gupta characters proves that the Tāntric works began to be composed not later than the seventh century A. D.

Their Date

The Tantras contain varied matter regarding Śākta worship and ritual. Their contents may be summarized as follows:

Contents

The conception of Deity as a Supreme Personality (*Parāhanta*) and of the double aspect of God in one of which He realizes or becomes the universe; a true emanation from Him in his creative aspect; successive emanations (*Ābhāsa-vyūha*) as of 'five from fire' from subtle to gross; doctrine of Śakti; pure and impure creation; the denial of unconscious Māyā such as Śaṅkara teaches; doctrine of Māyākośa and the Kañcukas; the carrying of the origin of things up and beyond Puruṣa-Prakṛti; acceptance at a later stage of Puruṣa-Prakṛti, the Sāṅkhya Guṇas, and evolution of Tattvas as applied to the doctrine of Śakti; affirming of the reality of the universe; emphasis on devotion (Bhakti); and provision for all castes and both sexes. Instances of common practice are, for example, Mantra, Bīja, Yantra, Mudrā Nyāsa, Bhūtaśuddhi, Kuṇḍalī-yoga, construction and consecration of temples and images (*Kriyā*), religious and social observances (*Caryā*), such as Āhnika. Varṇāśrama-dharma, Utsava, and practical magic (*Māyā-yoga*), where there is Mantra, Yantra, Nyāsa, Dīkṣā, Guru and the like, there is Tantra-śāstra. It is also called Mantra-śāstra.[5]

Various scholars have expressed their opinion in regard to the nature and contents of the Tantras. Elliot, while making a distinction between Tāntrism and Śāktism,[6] opined that the Tantras are 'a

Their abuses and disabuses

1. *Matisiddhānta-Tantra*, I. ii; iv. 4, 4.
2. Ward, *History, Literature, and Mythology of the Hindus*, II (p. 362 ff.).
3. Elliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*.
4. Farquhar, *O. R. L. I.*, pp. 199 ff.
5. Cf. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–57.
6. Elliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, I, xxxvi; II, etc.

simplification of religion, but on metaphysical rather than emotional lines.[1] Monier Williams and Bhattacarya speak of the 'terrible and horrible' aspects of the Vāmācāra cult. Barth, while admitting the philosophical depth of the Tāntric teachings expresses, that a 'Śākta is nearly always a hypocrite and a superstitious debauchee'.[2] However, the writings of Woodroffe and Avalon have proved beyond doubt that the Tāntric works convey a far reaching and deeper philosophical thought than was supposed to be up till now.[3]

Main Works

It is proposed to give here a brief survey of the main Tāntric writings. The main Tantras were: the *Rudra-Yāmala* (10th or 11th cen. A.D.); *Kulārṇava*, which is referred to by Lakṣmīdhara (end of the 13th cen. A. D.) and which is sometimes attrituted to Śaṅkara; the *Śāradā-Tilaka-Tantra* by Lakṣmaṇa Deśika (17th cen. A. D.); the *Kaula Upaniṣad*, the *Yoginī-Tantra* which probably refers to the Koch King Viṣṇusiṁha (1515-1540 A. D.); the *Mahā-nirvāṇa-Tantra* or the 'Tantra of Great Liberation' (19th cen. A.D., according to Gilmore); the commentary written on the same by Hariharānanda Bhārati (died 1833); the *Tantrasāra*, the authorship of which is attributed to Kṛṣṇānanda Bhaṭṭācārya, a contemporary of Bhattacharya,[4] but to Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa by Ronaldshay in his *Heart of Āryāvarta*'; the *Śāktānaīda-taraṅgiṇī*, written probably after 1821, according to Farquhar; and the *Kāmadhenu-T.* and the *Mantrakośa* (both belonging to the 18th cen. A. D.).

VII. SAKTA PHILOSOPHY AND YOGA

(a) Sākta Philosophy—(b) The Haṭha Yoga.

(a) Philosophy

Introductory

Though one is not in a position to state exactly when the Śākta philosophy came to be propounded, still the germs of it can be found in the early doctrine of the Puruṣa and Prakṛti as propounded by the great Kapila, the notion of Ardhanārīśvara, and finally the doctrine of Śiva-Śakti, which first becomes perceptible in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*. The Upaniṣad, while assimilating the main principles of the Sāṅkhya system has also emphatically stated that Māyā or Śakti forms part and parcel of Brahman. Eventually it must not have been long afterwards that a full-fledged Śākta philosophy came into vogue.

Like the Trika system of Kashmir the Śākta school has adopted the doctrine of the thirty-six Tattvas, and has partly followed the Vedāntic doctrine of Śaṅkara.

Side by side with the Tantras, the Purāṇas also have dealt with the main tenets of the Śākta philosophy. The *Devī-Upaniṣad*, the *Devī-Bhāgavata*, the *Brahmāṇḍa* and other *Purāṇas* are instances to the point.

Slater suggested that the Tāntric idea of the production of the universe by the blending of the male and female principles–the quiescent and the active (Śakti) which lies at the root of the whole of later mythology of India–owes its development to the popularization of the Sāṅkhya philosophic idea of the union of the two principles

1. *Ibid*, II, p. 275.
2. Barth, *Religions of India*, p. 204.
3. Avalon, *Principles of Tantras*, Intro, p. xLiv.
4. Slater, *Hinduism in Relation to Christianity*.

Puruṣa and Prakṛti.[1] Some other scholars have proposed that the philosophy underlying the Tantras are a modification of the Sāṅkhya and Vedānta systems[2]. But, in our opinion, Śāktism is but a later development of the ideas of Ardhanārīśvara or Śiva-Śakti which were so widely prevalent amongst the non-Aryans. The Sāṅkhya doctrine of Puruṣa and Prakṛti owes its very existence to this original idea of the proto-Indians and not *vice versa*. In fact the Sāṅkhya system was an off-shoot of the original philosophy of the non-Aryans.

Siva and Sakti

The greatest contribution of the Śāktas to Indian philosophy is their doctrine of Śakti as the motive power working behind the whole universe. In fact, they view God as the Mother of the universe, and assert that the ultimate Reality is *Saṁvid, Caitanya* or *Cit*, which, through its association with Māyā-Śakti, is operative to create the universe.[3]

Brahman is both *Sat* and *Cit*. There is no distinction of the experienced and the the experiencer in the ultimate Reality. There is nothing in the universe as apart from Ātman, which is the only all-pervading entity. *Cit* is pure and simple; and whatever is of changing appearance in the world, is all due to the working of Māyā-Śakti.

Unlike the Nyāya and Sāṅkhya systems, which propound that the chief end of man is the absolute cessation of pain, the Vedāntins lay stress on the positive Bliss which is of its essence.[4] According to the *Devī-Kalyāṇa* 'the mother of Bliss is herself Bliss.'

The *Kulārṇava-Tantra* explains the inscrutable nature of the Supreme Being. It says, 'Śiva is the impartial, Supreme Brahman, the all-knowing creator of all. He is the stainless one, and the Lord of all. He is one without a second (*Advaya*). He is light itself. He changes not and is without beginning or end. He is without attribute and is above the highest. He is Being (*Sat*), Consciousness (*Cit*), and Bliss (*Ānanda*)[5]. This state persists in all the states of Becoming which are its manifestation as Śakti.'

As Brahman is real, so also Cit is real. The Cit is real, the substratum of all that exists in the world. The universe is born, grows and dies in this entity. It is all-pervading, eternal, unproduced, and indestructible. The *Kaivalya-Kālikā-T.* explains how Cit is known through its manifestations only: 'We realise the presence of Rāhu or Bhūcchāyā (the eclipse) by his actions on the Sun and Moon. The eclipse is seen but is not the cause of it. Cit-Śakti is a name for the same changeless *Cit* when associated in creation with its operating Māyā-Śakti[6]. The Supreme Cit is called *Parāsaṁvit*.

1. Cf. Slater, *Hinduism in Relation to Christianity*.
2. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 71; Sten Konow, *Lehrbuch der Religion Geschichte*, II, 179.
3. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 254.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Kulārṇava-T.*, I-6, 7.
6. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

Sankara and Saktism

According to Śaṅkara, Māyā is mere illusion, and the only real entity being Brahman. But the Śāktas call Māyā as a particular Śakti of Brahman. Woodroffe explains the whole position clearly. He says, being Śakti, it is at base consciousness, but as Māyā-Śakti, it is consciousness veiling itself. Śakti and Śaktimān are one and the same; that is, Power and its possessor Śāktimān. Therefore Māyāśakti is Śiva or *Cit* in that particular aspect which he assumes as the material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) in creation. Creation is real; that is, there is a direct causal nexus between Śiva and Śakti (Cit-Śakti and Māyā-Śakti) and the universe. In short, Śiva as Śakti is the cause of the universe, and as Śakti in the form of Jīveśa, he actually evolves.'[1]

Eventually there are two aspects in the Brahman *i.e.* the *Prakāśa* or *Cit* aspect, and *Vimarśa-Śakti*, 'the potential *Idam*.' This *Vimarśa-Śakti* is of two forms: the subtle and the gross; and she works in two capacities, namely, Cid-rūpiṇī and Viśva-rūpiṇī. Thus the two '*I'ness*' and *that'ness*'', or the subjective and objective aspects are in the original entity itself. The Śakti is thus in her both capacities *e.g.* Cit, and herself in an undistinguishable union with Śiva.

Dissolution

The Śakti which was in a veiled state during the creation, again remains in its pure and subtle form in the state of final dissolution. She is then in an undistinguishable union with Śiva. The *Pāñcarātra* (*Ahir-budhnya*) *Saṁhitā*[2] explains the nature of this state: the Supreme state of Śakti returns to the condition of Brahman (*Brahma-bhāvam vrajate*). Owing to complete intensity of embrace the two all-pervading ones Nārāyaṇa and His Śakti become as it were a single principle. This return to the Brahman condition is said to take place in the same way as a conflagration, when there is no more combustible matter, returns to latent condition of fire (*Vahnibhāva*).[3] In this state the subject and object are in complete union.

Creation

Woodroffe observes that the nature of creation is rather an emanation *ābhāsa*—for the former term is associated with dualistic notions of an extra-cosmic God, who produces a world which is as separate from Himself as is the potter.[4] In this state, the Brahman still transcends the universe. Further again, Cit, though it transforms itself as Śakti into the universe, still transcends the creation. This is so in the case of all the evolutes, 'every stage of emanation process prior to the real evolution (*pariṇāma of Prakṛti*) remaining what it is, whilst giving birth to a new Evolution.' But it should be remembered that, unlike the Sāṅkhya theory in which *Pariṇāma* means a complete transformation of the sbject into the object (*i.e.* milk into curds), the Śāktas and Āgamic schools hold that the creation is simply an *ābhāsa* or 'shining forth.' The process of creation is called 'flame to flame,' meaning, that 'it is a process in which 'one flame springs from another flame.' This is a form of *vivarta*, though it should be distinguished from the '*vivarta*' propounded by Śaṅkara, in so far as the effect is considered as equally real.

---

1. *Ibid*, p. 263.
2. *Ahirbudhnya-Saṁhitā*, Chap. IV.
3. Cf. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 263.
4. *Ibid*, p. 266.

The Śāktas, like the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas preach that Icchā, Jñāna and Kalā (or will, knowledge and action) constitute the motive power in creation. From these the great Triangle of Energy (*Kāmakalā*), from which Śabda, Artha, and the forces of psychic and material worlds arise.[1]

Thus immediately the question of creation is in issue, Brahman is spoken of in its two aspects, namely, transcendental and empirical: *Niṣkala and Sakala Śiva ; Nirguṇa and Saguṇa : Para and Apara ; Paramātmā and Īśvara ;* and *Para-Brahman and Śabda-Brahman.*

Thirty-six Tattvas

The Śāktas like the Āgamic and Kashmir Śaivas speak of the thirty-six tattvas. The Śākta doctrine in general is akin to that of the Kashmir school in so far as it inclines ultimately towards *Advaitic* principles. It should be noted, however, that the Śiva-tattva and the Śakti-tattva are never produced. The latter is in its two aspects, namely, kinetic and potential e.g. Viśvarūpiṇī and Cid-rūpiṇī. (For details cf. *Kashmir Śaivism*).

The four states of Experience

The Śāktas postulate the existence of the four states of the soul, namely, *Jāgrat, Svapna, Suṣupti* and *Turīya.* All these are real 'whether it is the transcendental real of Sankara (turīya), or the empirical real of waking, dreaming or dreamless sleep.'

Liberation

The ultimate goal of a Sādhaka is the attaining of the pure and perfect *Cit* which is of the nature of *Saccidānanda.* 'The Ātmā which had bound itself by the Avidyā-mūrti of its Śakti liberates itself by its Vidyā-murti.'

Bhukti-Mukti

One of the greatest assets of Śāktism is its teaching of Bhukti-Mukti. Woodroffe aptly explains it as: 'The Vira has not seen the world from fear of it. He holds it in his grasp and wrests from it its secret. Then escaping from the conscious driftings of a humanity which has not yet realized itself, he is the illumined master of himself, whether developing all his powers or seeking liberation at will.'[2]

(*b*) *The Haṭha-yoga.*

One of the main contributions of Śāktism to the non-Aryan and later Hindu religion, of which it still forms a part, is its peculiar system of Haṭha-yoga. The Śāktas mainly preach and practise the Kuṇḍalinī or otherwise called the Haṭha-Yoga. We have already observed that the Mohenjo Darians were keen adepts in the science of Yoga. A section of the Vrātyas were yogins *par excellence.* Further, the famous Tāmil saint Tirumūlar, the Gorakhnāthis, and Jñāneśvara-in his commentary on the sixth Chapter of the Gītā, have preached the importance of the Kuṇḍalinī-yoga. The word Kuṇḍalinī seems to have been derived from the Tāmiḷ word Kuḍalāi. Thus the Haṭha-Yoga seems to be of a very ancient origin.

According to the Śāktas the practice of Yoga brings about the union of the individual soul and the Supreme Being. It actually makes the soul free from the shackles of Māyā. The *Gheraṇḍa Saṁhitā* states that, 'there is no bond equal in strength to Māyā, and no power to destroy that bond than Yoga.' The person who

1. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 354.
2. *Ibid.*

wishes to practise Yoga must be a fit man (adhikārī). The Tantras generally speak of the four forms of Yoga *i.e.* *Mantra-yoga*, *Laya-yoga*, *Haṭha yoga* and *Rāja-yoga*. The *Sammohana-Tantra* preaches five kinds of Yoga; *Jñāna*, *Rāja*, *Laya*, *Haṭha* and *Mantra*, which are said to be the five aspects of the spiritual life, namely, Dharma, Kriyā, Bhāva, Jñāna and Yoga. The seven Sādhanas or preparatory stages consist of Ṣaṭ-karma, Āsana, Mudrā, Pratyāhāra, Prāṇāyāma, Dhyāna and Samādhi, which cleanse the body, seat, postures for gymnastic and other purposes, the abstraction of the senses from their objects, breath control, meditation, and ecstasy, which is both Savikalpa (imperfect) and Nirvikalpa (perfect).[1] The Samādhi of Laya and Rāja-yogas is the Savikalpa and Nirvikalpa Samādhi respectively. The practice of the above processes obtains for the practiser purity (Śodhana), firmness and strength (dṛdhatā), fortitude (Sthiratā), steadiness (Dhairya), lightness (Lāghava), realisation (Pratyakṣa), and detachment (Nirliptattva). The body consists of innumerable number of Nāḍīs or channels of occult force. Woodroffe gives a fine description of the different parts of the body. He says, 'The six centres are the *Mūlādhāra* or root-support situated at the base of the spinal column (merudaṇḍa) in a position midway in the perenæum between the root of the genitals and the anus. They are the vital centres within the spinal column in the white and the grey matter there. Above it in the genitals, abdomen, heart, chest or throat, and in the forehead between the two eyes are the Svādisṭhāna, Maṇipūra, Viśuddha and Ājñā Cakras or lotuses (padmas) respectively. The *Advaita-mārtaṇḍa* speaks of even fifty Cakras. The seventh region beyond the Cakras is the upper brain, the highest centre of manifestation of consciousness in the body and therefore the abode of the supreme Śiva-Śakti in the Sahasrāra.'[2] It should also be noted that the lowest Cakra consists of Brahmā in the form of the Liṅga, and the Devī is asleep, having coiled herself around it three and a half times.

The number of petals is varied *e.g.* 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16 and 20, commencing from the Mūlādhāra and ending with Ājñā. There are fifty petals in all, as are the letters of the alphabet which are in them.[3] As apart from the Dhyāna or Bhāvanā-yoga, the Kuṇḍalinī-yoga consists of the rousing up of the Kuṇḍalinī and making her travel through the various circles by way of Suṣumnā (spinal cord). This act is known as Ṣaṭ-cakra-bheda or the piercing of the six Cakras. Unlike the Dhyāna-yogī, who does not make any effort towards arousing the Kuṇḍalinī at different centres, he obtains different forms of Bliss (ānanda) and gains special powers. He carries her to the Śiva of his cerebral centre and enjoys the supreme Bliss. The Kundalinī is described as the 'inner woman that shines like a chain of lights'[4]. The Haṭha-yogī has both enjoyment (Bhukti) and liberation (Mukti) in the fullest sense of the expression.[5]

VIII. SAKTISM IN BENGAL

Śāktism has attained a very great popularity in Bengal. Payne[6] and some other scholars have observed that the natural phenomena and the historical back-

1. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 633.
2. *Ibid*, p. 639.
3. *Ibid*. p. 640.
4. *Ibid*, p. 649.
5. *Ibid*, p. 658.
6. Payne, *The Śāktas*, pp. 81–83.

ground of Bengal must have helped towards the development of the cult there. To quote a single instance : the ghastly and terrible effects of nature* might have given rise to such feelings as expressed in Rabindranath Tagore's play 'Sacrifice': 'Our Mother is all caprice. She knows no law. Our sorrows and joys are mere freaks of her mind.'

In regard to the origin of Śāktism in Bengal, Payne suggests, that the Śākta practices and beliefs are traceable to the Dravidian and Mongolian peoples, and that they passed into Hinduism by a natural upward transition, as aboriginal non-Aryan and casteless tribes adopted officially the religion of those immediately above them in the social scale.[1] Lyall expresses the view that, 'The ethnical frontier is an ever-breaking store of primitive beliefs, which tumble constantly into the ocean of Brahmanism.'[2] Even the Cīnācāra or the Pañcatattva system is said to have been introduced into Bengal from China and other countries. We have already observed that the early beginnings of the history of Mother Goddess can be traced to the land of the Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, though a full-fledged system actually came into being only during the period of the Mahābhārata. Both the works of Bāṇa and the accounts of Yuan Chwang point out that the worship of the Mother Goddess must have spread everywhere into the dominions of Harṣa which included also Bihar and part of Bengal. And the Tāntric movement came into full force in both Hinduism and Buddhism between A. D. 550 and 900.

As soon as Bengal became free from the clutches of the Sultans of Delhi, a new impetus was given to the Śākta ideas irrespective of the anarchy which then prevailed. Dr. D. C. Sen is of opinion that, 'Bengāli literature begins about this time, as it is full of the struggle between the worshippers of local Goddesses who claimed to be Śāktas and the more orthodox Hindus.'[3] Individual Muslim rulers patronised literature. *The Kālikā-Tantra* was a product of the fourteenth century. But Śāktism used to receive a set-back at the hands of the Mahommedan Sultans. 'The Fanatical' Firoz Shah Tughlak (1351–1388) daringly states, 'I cut off the heads of the elders of this sect and banished the rest, so that their abominable practices were put an end to.'[4]

During the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries Tāntrism received a great blow at the hands of Caitanya (1485–1533) and his followers. The following conditions prevailed. Mr. T. Kennedy[5] observes, 'that at the time of Chaitanya's birth cults of aboriginal origin *e. g.* those of Manasā Devī (the serpent-Goddess), Dharma Thakkur, Dakshrī Rāi (the tiger-god), Caṇḍī and many others attached to the Śākta sect, were widely prevalent. The poison of Tāntric practices left behind by Buddhism, and also deep set in current Hinduism, had gone far in the social order and exercised a peculiarly debasing influence on religious thought. The Śākta sect, which was probably the principal element in the Hinduism of that day, was neither a spiritual nor an æsthetic element in religion. Its annual sacrifice was a coarsening

1. Payne, *op. cit.*, p. 84.
2. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, pp. 102-3, (Annals of Rural Bengal).
3. Sen, *HBLL*, p. 251.
4. Smith, *OHI*, p. 250.
5. M. T. Kennedy, *The Caitanya Movement*, p. 3.

feature, while the Tāntric strain of licentiousness in the theory and practice of its Vāmācāri school gave it tremendous power for evil.'

Immediately after the death of Caitanya, religious disputes arose between the Śāktas and theVaiṣṇavas. The Vaiṣṇavas would not utter the word Kālī (meaning ink) and the name of the Java flower (red *hibiscus*), which was favourite to Kālī. The Śāktas even went to the length of ridiculing the Vaiṣṇavas. In fact when Narottama Das died, a body of Śāktas followed his bier, clapping and hissing as a sign of contempt for the illustrious dead[1].

Side by side with the reign of Akbar, Mukundarāma, called the 'gem of poets' (kavīkaṅkaṇā) flourished in the early beginning of the 16th century. His chief composition was a work called *Caṇḍī e.g. Caṇḍīkāvya* (A.D. 1589). The poem retells the popular legends of Kālakētu, the hunter, and of the merchant princes Dhanapati Śrīmanta, the latter connected with Kālī at Tāmluk.[2] In about 1600 A. D. Govinda Das composed his famous poem on the popular story of Vidyā and Sundara, which was later retold by Rāma Prasād and Bhārata Chandra Ray.[3]

In 1565 the Koch ruler Nara Nārāyaṇa, mainly under the influence of Śaṅkara-Deva rebuilt the temple of Kāmākṣī. It is said that about one hundred and forty men were sacrificed on the occasion.[4] Bankim Chatterji, in his famous novel *Kapāla-Kuṇḍalā*, depicts the picture of the age of Akbar (1627–1658).

During the early years of the 18th century Bhāsakararāya or Bhāskarānanda-nāth, a court-pundit in Tanjore, wrote commentaries on some of the earlier Tāntric works.[5] The *Meru-Tantra* was written during the eighteenth century. About this time again were written the famous *Mahānirvāṇa-T.* and the *Tantrasāra*. Many Śākta poets flourished during this period, 'the chief among them being Rāma Prasād (1718–75) and Bhārat Chandra Ray (1722-60).' Rāma Prasād wrote the 'unsuccessful version of the *Vidyā-Sundara story*.' 'Even Bhārat Chandra Ray wrote on the same subject under *Ānanda-maṅgala*. He was a poet of great fame, and his style was imitated by many poets in later times.'

Rāma Prasād-Payne rightly observes[6]: 'The spirituality of the old man, his genuineness, and his sincerity continue to make their appeal, and his songs are still known and loved all over Bengal. Sister Nivedita tells us that they were often on the lips of Swāmi Vivekānanda. There are many echoes of them in the poems of Rabindra-nath Tagore. His lyrics are sometimes delicate and haunting.' He wrote many excellent poems, which are full of Śākta elements.

Rāma Prasād was a mystic *par excellence*. In his earlier years he served as a copyist, but afterwards he was appointed in the court of the Rājas of Kṛṣnagar. Some of his poems e.g. 'The voice of a man entangled in life's duties and difficulties, and wishing he could escape to give himself to the service of God,' or that 'of the

1. Sen, *HBLL*, p. 577. 2. Cf. Payne, *op. cit.*, p. 90; Sen, *HBLL*, pp. 298–303; Glasenapp. *Heilige Statten Indiens*, p. 117. 3. Payne, *op. cit*, p. 90; Sen, *HBLL.*, pp.637–53; Thompson, *BRLS*, pp.18–19; Glassenapp, *Der Hinduismus*, p.396.

4. Gait, *History of Assam*, p. 56 f.; Anderson, 'Assam,' *E. R. E.*, II, p. 134; Glassenapp, *HSI.*, p. 120.

5. Farquhar, *O R L I.*, pp. 192, 358. 6. Payne, *op. cit.*, p.96.

illustration of his rejection of the current attitude to pilgrimages and ceremonies, or those that deal with death and the here-after', are of absorbing interest. Though a devout Śākta he was against the pilgrimages and ceremonies, and Tāntric practices.[1] The song on death appealed to the great Rabindranath Tagore so much that his songs also contain some original expressions of Rāma Prasād :

'My play is finished, Mother. My play is finished, thou joyous One. It was a play that I came to the earth, I have taken its dust and played. O, thou Daughter of the Mountains, now am I in fear of death, for death is close at hand. In childhood's days what games I had ! Then I wasted in the joys of married life the breath that should have been given to prayer.'[2]

In regard to the poems of Rāma Prasād, Sen rightly observes, 'through the fierce and the terrible he sees the sweet moon-light of grace that suddenly breaks forth, and Kālī is no more than a symbol to him—a symbol of divine punishment, of divine grace, and of divine motherhood.'[3]

After Rāma Prasād, Kamalākānta Bhaṭṭācārya (c. 1800) and Daśarathi Ray (1804-57) came into prominence. During the nineteenth century Debendranath Tagore (1818-1905) introduced the song from the *Mahānirvāṇa-Tantra*, to be sung every day in Brahmo Samāj service. Best of all, Swāmi Rāmakrishṇa Paramahaṁsa was a devotee of Kālī, and his sayings contain much that belongs to the province of Śāktism. Keshub Chandra Sen, Swāmi Vivekānanda and Brahmabāndhav Upādhyāya were greatly influenced by his doctrines. Other later instances from Bengal in regard to the spread of Śāktism are the observance of the festival of Durgā, the national song on '*Vande Mātaram*', and the pamphlet on Bhavāni Mandir by Ghose. Thus the contribution of Bengal in the field of Śāktism is great indeed ! It is still a living force there.

1. Elliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, II, p.288.
2. Cf. Payne, *op. cit.*, p.96.
3. Sen, *HBLL.*, p. 714.

CHAPTER VII

MŪRUGA OR KĀRTTIKĒYA

Proto-Indian Period—Vedic Period and later—Epic and Purāṇic accounts on birth of Kārttikeya—Mūrugaṇ in Tāmiḻ Land—In other Provinces—Some General Aspects.

I. Proto-Indian Period

The history of Mūruga or Kārttikēya, or, more popularly known as Subrahmaṇya in the South, is of an absorbing interest. Like the early history of Śiva-Pārvatī and other deities of the Vrātya pantheon, the history of Kārttikeya was also shrouded in mystery up-till-now. But the Indus Valley discoveries have thrown sufficient light on the origin of this God.

Mūrugaṇ or Vēlan, the proto-type of the historic Kārttikēya, was one of the gods of the Divine Triad. The inscriptions have detailed some of the characteristics of this god. One of them records, "the people of the united countries of Velan of the harvest counted on one side."[1] In this connection Father Heras observes that, 'Velan means 'the one of the trident' and is even at present used as a name of Subrahmaṇya in South India. Velan has always been the god of the Velālas for he holds the *Vel* after which they themselves are styled'[2]. It should be noted that in the above inscription Velan is spoken of in connection with the harvest.

Another inscription states that, 'the moon (is) over the White Mountain of Velan of the *liṅga* of the divided house of the two high suns'.[3] Father Heras points out that, 'the inscription states that the moon is over the White Mountain of he of Velan. The latter being a son of Śiva in the historic period, he should also be a son of Āṇ in the proto-historic period. Now Āṇ has only one son styled Āṇil literally meaning 'the son of Āṇ.' His proper name is Mūrugaṇ, the ancient Dravidian name of Subrahmaṇya, found in one of the inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro, which reads, '*Mūrugaṇ adu*', 'that is Mūrugaṇ.'[4] As Father Heras observes, 'we can safely state that he of Velan (or Mūrugaṇ) is Āṇ, the proto-type of Śiva. Quite properly the White Mountain, one of the middle mountains mentioned above, is said to belong to Āṇ, for Śiva is supposed to have his dwelling in Kailāsa, a peak of the Himālayas.'[5]

II. The Vedic Period and Later

That the early name by which the later Kārttikēya or Subrahmaṇya was designated was Mūrugaṇ, becomes evident from the expression *Mūradevāḥ* used in the *Ṛgveda*.[6] The expression Mūradevāḥ, described as having bent necks, has been variously interpreted by scholars. Sāyaṇa comments on it as 'destructive Rākṣasas.'

1. Marshall, *op. cit.*, III, M. D. No. 397.
2. Heras, 'The Velalas of Mohenjo Daro'. *New Indian Antiquary*, I, p. 52.
3. Photo, *M. D.*, 1930-31, Dk, 10541.
4. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 52; Photo *M. D.*, 1928-29, No. 5890.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Cf. *Ṛgveda*, VII, 104. 24; X. 87. 2; and X, 87. 14. On first Sāyaṇa interprets—*Māraṇa-krīḍā-Rākṣasa*; in the other two as, *Mūḍha-dēvān...māraka-vyāpārān rākṣasān*, or simply *Māravyāpārān*, etc. Wilson renders the term as 'those who believe in vain gods.'

As we have suggested, the *Mūradeva* forms one of the deities of the Divine Triad of the proto-Indian period (cf. for details under *Vrātyas*-Part I).

In the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, Agni and Vāyu are described as the servants or attendants of Indra called by the name Subrahmaṇya.[1] Narayana Ayyar[2] rightly proposes that, 'the Southerners were influenced by this wide-spread movement, and identifying their own deity *Murugaṇ* with Subrahmaṇya, they regarded him as an equal to Indra and Varuṇa.' The *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* refers to the word Skanda.[3] The word Kumāra, by which name Kārttikēya is known later on, is referred to in the *Ṛgveda*,[4] and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[5] But the word Kumāra used here does not at all signify the later Kārttikeya.

II. The Epic and the Purāṇic accounts on the birth of Kārttikeya

The Epics and the Purāṇas have detailed various stories in regard to the birth of this god. The *Rāmāyaṇa*[6] describes that Kārttikeya was the son of Agni and Gaṅgā. The *Mahābhārata* details the following story:

'Agni fell in love with the wives of the seven Ṛṣis, and being unable to attain the object of his love resolved in despair to give up his corporeal form. Svāhā, one of Dakṣa's daughters, who, enamoured of Agni, taking advantage of the opportunity, appeared before him in the guise of the wives of six out of the seven Ṛṣis, for she could not assume the divine form of Arundhatī, the wife of Vasiṣṭha, and had intercourse with him in succession. She repaired, every time after her union with Agni, to the top of an inaccessible mountain, and threw there in a golden reservoir, his seed, out of which arose in course of time a son with six heads, twelve ears, eyes, arms and feet united to a single body and neck. While still a babe of four days, he split the Krauñca hill, demolished one of the Śveta mountains, and caused a great commotion in Svarga. The Ṛṣis, who learnt from the panic-striken Gods that the cause of their trouble was the son born to their wives through their illicit intercourse with Agni, cast them off. In course of time, the boy became a mighty hero and was formally invested in the presence of the assembled gods, including Śiva, with the insignia of his office, and his marriage with Dēvasēnā was duly celebrated. The wives of the six Ṛṣis who had been abandoned unjustly by their husbands then came to him, and having explained their sad plight begged him to provide them with some place in heaven. Kumāra took pity on them and persuaded Indra to accomodate them in the neighbourhocd of Rohiṇī in the place vacated by Abhijit who had gone to perform austerities. Thenceforward these six wives of the Ṛṣis are shown in the sky under the name of Kṛttikās with Agni as their presiding deity.'[7]

The Purāṇas give varied accounts regarding the birth of Kārttikēya. The main story may be briefly narrated as follows:

1. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, I. 12, 3.
2. C.V.N. Ayyar, *Saivism in South India*, pp. 102 ff.
3. 'Yo Vai Rudra sa Bhagavān yasca Skandaḥ tasmai vai namo namaḥ' (*Muir, O.S.T.*, IV, p.35). 4-5. *Rg.* V,2; *Śatapatha Brā*, 6.1.3.7-8 (cf. under Siva).
6. *Ramayaṇa* I, chap. 37.
7. cf. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra-Siva*, p. 73; *Mbh.* III, 228,229.

'The Gods who were sorely beset by Tāraka, approached Śiva with request that he should give them a commander capable of destroying the demon. Śiva ageed. To implement his promise, annoyed beyond measures at the unwelcome intrusion, Śiva discharged upon Agni the seed intended for Umā's womb. Groaning under its weight the latter made at first an unsuccessful attempt to deposit the precious burden in the celestial Gaṅgā; next, he proceeded to the lake Saravaṇa where on perceiving the wives of the Seven Ṛṣis, he was smitten with love and when all of them excepting Arundhati came to him believing him to be mere fire, he embraced them, and penetrating into their wombs deposited therein the seed of Śiva. They became pregnant forthwith. Fearing the wrath of their husbands they forcibly ejected the seed from their wombs and placing it on a lotus leaf in the lake, returned to their homes. The Ṛṣis, however, were not deceived; irate with their spouses for their unworthy conduct, they cast them out without compunction.' [1]

Mainly depending upon these and several other passages in the Vedic and Purāṇic literature, Veṅkataramanayya emphatically states, 'Nevertheless, it is in these Vedic texts that we catch the earliest glimpses of the later war-god in his embryonic state; the incidents of his birth and some of the names such as Kumāra, Agnibhūḥ, Śarajanmā, Kārttikēya and Senānī by which he is known, clearly indicate that before his differentiation into a separate deity and affiliation of Śiva and Pārvatī as their son, Skanda-Kumāra was closely associated with Agni.[2] But, we are not to be easily convinced with the line of argumentation adopted by him. The abrupt rise of a god out of 'nothing' seems to us an utter impossibility. The early account of the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and the Śaṅgam literature do point out that Kārttikēya had an independent personality of his own since originally, and what the Vedic Brāhmans seem to have done is that they have attempted to Aryanize this early deity of the non-Aryans. They had already identified Rudra with Agni. Eventually Kārttikēya also was depicted as the child of Agni, possessing all the characteristics of the latter.

It should also be noted that Venkataramanayya has altogether kept in the backgroud the fact of the independent existence of Mūrugaṉ so often appearing in the Tāmiḻ literature.

III. Mūrugaṉ in Tāmiḻ Literature

Mūrugaṉ or Mūruga is a very popular deity amongst the Tāmiḻs since ancient times. He is very often referred to in the Śaṅgam literature. The Tolkāppiyam

1. Venkataramanayya, *op. cit*, p. 72. For the story of the birth of Kārttikeya and the destruction of Tarakāsura see the following: *Skānda*, *Kaumārikā-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 16; *ibid*, *Māheśvara-khaṇḍa*, *Kedāra-kha*. Adh. 31 (In Adh. 28 is described the Kumāra-Mucukunda war); *ibid*, *Nāgarakhaṇḍa*, 244 ff.; *Anuśāsana* P., 130 ff.; *Liṅga*, *Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 100; *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Madhyabhāga*, Adh. 65; *ibid*, *Uttarabhāga* Adh 11; *Śiva P. Rudra-saṁhitā Pārvatī-kh*. Adh. 13. On the birth of Kārttikeya: *Padma P*. 5, *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 37 ff.; *Salya P*. Adh. 45 ff.; *Skānda P. Caturāśīti-Liṅga-Māhātmya*, Adh. 6; *Varāha P*. Adh. 25-32 ff; *Vana P*. Adh 225-26; *Viṣṇudharmottara*, *Prathama-kh*. Adh. 229 ff.; *Siva P. Rudra-Saṁhitā*, *Kumāra-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 3; *Garuḍa P. Pūrva-khaṇḍa*, *Prathamāṁśa*, Adh. 6; *Brahmāṇḍa P. Madhyabhāga*, Adh. 10; *Vāmana P*. Adh. 57; and *Saura P*., Adh. 53.
2. Venkataramanayya, *op. cit*., p. 74 ff,

mentions the following gods, 'Māyon or Kṛṣṇa, 'Śeyon' or the Red God Subrahmaṇya, 'Vendan' or Indra and Varuṇa.'[1] Further it is described that, 'the forest region which is dear to the ocean-coloured, the mountain region to the red Mūrugaṉ, the well-watered river region dear to Varuṇa, are respectively known as Mullai, Kuruñjī, Marudam and Neydal.'[2] Mūruga was considered by the Tāmiḷs as a god of the Northern region. The commentator of the Tolkāppiyam Naccinar-kiniyar refers to the worship of Mūruga. He observes that, 'in the Kuruñji region the Kuravas (or the dwellers of the forest region), and others are found to offer several oblations in the sacrifice to the Red God.'[3] It is further stated that, 'she (the worshipper) will recover if the powerful and famous Mūrugaṉ who destroyed the peoples of the earth is worshipped.'

Further the two trees Veṅgai (*Pterocarpus Bilobus*) and Kadampo (*Eugenia racemosa*) are sacred to him.[4] Mūrugaṉ is described as dwelling on high hills covered with Veṅgai trees.[5] He inhabits in Kadampo trees. He performs the Kuravai dance with Kurava maids, dwellers of mountain homes. He rides now on an elephant, now a goat, or again on a peacock.[6] His banner has a wild fowl for its device.[7]

The chief scene of his activities is the battle-field where he figures by the side of the Great Demoness putting her in the shade by his powers and military skill. He marches at the head of imps and gives victory to the fanciful Maravar who never fails to propitiate him by sacrifices and druken revels before and after battle.'[8]

A graphic description of the orgies in honour of Mūrugaṉ is found in Paṭṭu-paddu.[9] 'A shed is put up and is adorned with garlands and flowers. High above it is hoisted Mūrugaṉ's flag bearing the wild fowl's device, to scare away, as the commentator suggests, blood-thirsty goblins from the feast. His priest who bears his favourite weapon *Vel* or javelin and who is therefore known as Velan (the name of God also) has a red thread round his wrist probably as a sign of consecration to the deity. He worships at the altar and uttering spells and incantations scatters flowers, and fried paddy on all sides. He then slaughters a fat bull, and in its warm blood mixes boiled rice and offers it to the god amidst blare of horns, bells and drums, while the perfumes of incense and flowers fill the place. Today of course, it forms an integral part of the service whose characteristic name is *veri-addu*, druken revelry. The Velan as well as the women present begin to dance to the frantic songs of the assistance. And some one in the company-it is usually the Velan-becomes possessed by the deity and jumps and snorts, giving out at the same time oracles as regards the fortunes of the by-stander. These sacrifices to Mūrugaṉ seem to have been very prevalent in the South of India in ancient times; so much so that all sacrifices have come to be known by the name *Murugu*.[10] The modern devil dance of the villager is but a repetition of the *veri-addu* of the ancient days.'[11]

1. *Tolkāppiyam*, *Por*. 5.
2. *Nach Com* p. 131.
3. *Aham*, 22.
4. Cf. Jnana Prakasar, *Siddhānta Saivism*, pp 117 ff.
5. PP. *Venpa-malai*, XII, 10.
6. *Paṭṭu-paddu*, IV, 75.
7. *Ibid*, I. 82. 210.
8. *Puram*, IV, 19. P.P. V, I, 21 ; XII, 10.
9. *Paṭṭu-paddu*, I 220-249.
10. *Ibid*, VI, 38.
11. Jnana Prakasar, *op cit*., p 118.

Mūrugaṇ was believed to enter into unwary passers-by and afflict them with all the effects of demoniacal possession.[1] In the *Kanda-Purāṇam*, 'it is said that when Vally showed signs of possession a "drunken revelry" was held by the Kuravai, the kinsmen of the valley. An old priestess officiated. While she was indulging in paroxisms of religious frenzy, Mūrugaṇ entered her frame and told the expectant crowd that it was himself who had laid his hand on the damsel when she was alone in a jungle sojourn.'[2]

IV. Skanda in other Provinces

It is very interesting to note that Kautilya in the Chapter on *Durga-nivāsa* states that, 'In the centre of the city, the apartments of gods such as Aparājita Apratihata, Jayanta, Vaijayanta, Śiva, Vaiśravaṇa, Aśvi, and the abode of the goddess Madirā shall be made. In the corners the guardian deties of the ground shall be appropriately set up.'[3] Patañjali refers to the images of Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha.[4] The reverse of the coins of the Kushāṇa prince Kaniṣka contains the figures with their names in Greek letters of Skando, Mahāsēno, Komāro and Bizago (or Viśākha).[5] Banerjea has given some other important details.[6] On the coins of the Kushāṇa Emperor Huvishka is represented Skanda Kārttikeya. Further, on the reverse of a circular copper coin of Devamitra, a local king of Ayodhyā of an early date (c. first cen. A. D.) we find a symbol which has been described by V. A. Smith as 'cock on top of the post' (Pl II. fig. 5). The same device is to be found on some coins of Vijayamitra (Nos. 31 and 32). Banerjea argues that probably it was based on a cock-crested column special to Kārttikeya.[7] Kārttikēya appears in human form sometimes in a poly-cephalous (six-headed) manner on the unique silver and certain copper coins of the Yaudheyas, belonging to the second century A. D. The obverse of one class of these coins bears the six-headed but two-armed Kārttikēya (Ṣaḍānana), holding a long spear (Śakti, the special emblem of Kārttikēya) in his right hand, the left hand resting on hip; the reverse bears the goddess, presumably Lakṣmī with an aureole round her head, and not a six-headed goddess as Cunningham describes it: The legend on the silver coin has been reconstructed by Allan as '*Yaudhēya-Bhāgavata-Svāmino Brahmaṇya (sa or sya)*', and on the copper coins as *Bhāgavato Svāmino Brahmaṇya-deva-ya (or sa) Kumārasya (or sa)*.[8] Marshall, while referring to a well-executed seal (3rd or 4th cen. A. D.) found by him in the course of excavations at Bhita, says that the inscription reads 'of the illustrious Mahārāja Gautamīputra Vṛsadhvaja, the penetrator of the Vindhyas, who had made over his kingdom to the great Lord Kārttikēya.' The appellation *Mahēśvara-Mahāsēnāpati-rāṣṭrasya* is significant. Marshall remarks, 'It seems to indicate that in ancient times there may have existed a peculiar custom according to which rulers, on the occasion of their accession, entrusted their kingdom to their Iṣṭadevatā and considered themselves as their mere agents.'[9]

---

1. *Ibid.* 2. *Ibid*, p. 118.
3. *Arthaśāstra* (Trans. by R. Shama Sastri), p. 59.
4. *Patañjali on Panini*, V. 3. 99. 5. *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, XX, p. 385.
6. Banerjea, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, pp. 155 ff.
7. *Ibid* p 155.
8. Allan, C. A., p. cxlix cl; Banerjea, *op. cit., loc. cit.*
9. Banerjea, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

The Yaudheyas, who are also known as Matta-Māyūrakas, had occupied the country of Rohitaka, which was styled in the Mahābhārata as one being specially favoured by Kārttikēya.'[1] The Bilsad stone-pillar inscription (415-16 A. D.) of Kumāragupta I records the grant by one Dharmaśarman to the temple of Svāmi Mahāsēna.[2] It also mentions the word Brahmaṇyadeva. The Guptas were evidently keen devotees of Kārttikēya as their names Kumāra and Skanda indicate. An elaborate iconographic type occurs on the reverse of the 'peacock' type gold coins of Kumāragupta I. 'It shows the God Kārttikeya nimbate riding on the peacock (Paravani) holding spear in left hand over shoulder, his right hand being in the *varada* pose; his figure is placed on an elaborate *pañcaratha* pedestal.[3] The famous work *Kumāra-sambhava* deals with the birth of this great God. It is interesting to note that, 'Śūdraka, the author of the famous play *Mṛcchakaṭika*, introducing a thief as one of the characters in his drama, makes him, before starting on his profession, invoke the blessings of Skanda.' The *Skānda Purāṇa* gives a graphic description of the Stambhēśvara-tīrtha.

V. *Some General Aspects*

We have already observed that at least till the end of the Mahābhārata period Skanda was not in any way associated with Gaṇapati, who came into existence only in later times. Subrahmaṇya is described as the Preceptor (Guru) of the world. He is further depicted as the Generalissimo of the Gods *par excellence*. This, however, does not seem to have been his original characteristic.

Since the time of the epics various names are attributed to him *e.g.* Kārttikēya, Ṣaṇmukha or Ṣaḍānana, Śaravanabhava or Śarajanman, Sēnānī, Tārakajit, Krauñcabhēttā, Gaṅgāputra, Guha, Agnibhū, Skanda, Svāminātha, Subrahmaṇya, *etc.* The *Kumāra-Tantra* depicts some of the important aspects of Subrahmaṇya *e.g.* Śaktidhara, Skanda, Subrahmaṇya, Gajavāhana, Śaravaṇabhava, Kārttikēya, Kumāra, Ṣaṇmukha, Tārakāri, Sēnānī, Brahmaśāstā, Valli-Kalyāṇa-sundara-mūrti, Balasvāmi, Krauñcabhēttā and Śikhivāhana.[4]

The word Subrahmaṇya used in connection with Mūruga seems to have been one of the modes of Aryanizing the deity. Some of the epithets like Kārttikeya (son of *Pleidas*), Śarajanman, Agnibhū, *etc.* seem to be of Brahmanic origin.

With Skanda are associated the spirits (*grahas*) or 'mothers'. They are said to wander in the night time and prove dangerous to people. The Purāṇas enjoin a Bali or oblation to them[5] (cf. under *Ritual*). His wife's name is Ṣaṣṭhī.[6] The *Mahābhārata* describes Skanda's several forms as brothers or sons, *viz.*, Śākha Viśākha, and Naigama. His *vāhana* is the cock (Kukkuṭa) or the peacock.

Subrahmaṇya is a very popular God in the South. His popularity is so great that various 'shrines are built for him in all places such as towns, villages, gardens, mountain tops, and other old places.'[7]

1. *Mahābhārata*, III. 32, 45.
2. Fleet, *C.I.I.* III, pp. 45-6.
3. Banerjea, *op. cit.*, pp. 155 ff.
4. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II. ii, pp. 415 ff.
5. Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara P.*, *Prathama-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 230.
6. *Devī-Bhāgavata*, *Skanda* IX. 46, 5.
7. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II. ii, pp. 416.

His nurse is the 'maiden of the red (bloody) sea' called Lohitāyanī. He is always described as 'the god of a thousand arms, the Lord of all, the creator of gods and demons.' The accounts relating to him as being of terrible appearance and fearful acts, make him an equal of Śiva.[1]

It is said that in Bengal he is worshipped by disreputable women on certain occasions, while in the Bombay Presidency no *samangalī* (a women whose husband is alive) would visit the temple of Kārttikēyaswāmi.[2]

According to the Āgamas a Svayampradhāna temple built in honour of Kārttikēya requires to be set up eight *Parivāra devatās*: Yakṣēndra, Rākṣasēndra, Piśācēndra, Bhūtarāṭ, Gandharva, Kinnara, Daityanāyaka and Dānavādhipa. Besides, there are to be the eight body-guards (śarīra-pālakas): Ṣanmukha, Śakti-pāṇī, Kārttikēya, Guha, Skanda, Mayūravāhana, Senānī, and Śakti-hastavān. The *Kumāra-Tantra* prescribes a list of eight, twelve, sixteen or thirty-two Devatās. It also gives the description of the Dvārapālakas of the shrine of Subrahmaṇya called Sudēha and Sumukha who are said to be Brāhmans.

Kārttikēya is represented with six faces (Ṣaḍānana) and as riding on a peacock. He is called Ṣaṇmātura because he is supposed to have been brought up by the six mothers, the Kṛttikās (*Pleidas*).

In South India the worship of Subrahmaṇya is closely associated with the serpent. 'The common name Subba or Subbarāya found among the Telugu, Kannaḍa and Tāmiḷ people is explained to be both a contraction of Subrahmaṇya and a synonym for serpent.[3] Krishna Sastri observes, 'the sixth day of a lunar month (Ṣaṣṭhī) is held as peculiarly sacred to Subrahmaṇya, as to the serpent God. His riding on a peacock, his marriage with the forest maid Valliyammān, and the fact that his most famous temples are on hill-tops, show that he is connected with the ancient tree and serpent worship and the sylvan deities. It may be noted that the day Ṣaṣṭhī (six) sacred to serpent worship in Southern India is celebrated by feeding Brahmacāris and presenting clothes to them.'[4]

In Mahārāṣṭra Kārttikēya is very popularly known as Khaṇḍoji. 'In that district (province) he is everywhere revered as a household deity and numerous temples are erected for his worship. The shepherds claim him as their tutelary deity. He is most frequently represented as riding on horseback, attended by a dog and accompanied by his wife *Malsarā*, another form of Pārvatī As he generally carries in his hand a big sword his name is popularly derived from Khaṇḍe, sword.'[5] Jejūrī is one of the famous pilgrim centres. Malhāra-Rao Holkar was a worshipper of this deity.

1. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 415.
2. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 416.
3. Krishna Sastri, *Images of South Indian Gods and Goddesses*, p. 178.
4. *Ibid*, pp. 177-78.
5. Oppert, *Original Inhabitants of India*, p. 157.

The most well-known shrines built in honour of Subrahmaṇya in the South are: Tiruttani, Palnis, Tirupparangunram, Kunnakudi on the sea-shore as at Tiruchchendur, etc.[1]

We have already referred to the Soma-Skanda images found in the temples of Southern India. Subrahmaṇya is represented as Brahma-śāstā, an aspect of Subrahmaṇya in which he put down the pride of Brahmā by exposing his ignorance of the Vedas. Another representation of Skanda called Deśika Subrahmaṇya indicates the aspect in which Subrahmaṇya taught Śiva, his own father, the significance of the sacred syllable *Om*.[2]

1. Krishna Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 178.
2. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II, ii, pp. 439, 443.

CHAPTER VIII

GANAPATI OR THE ELEPHANT-FACED GOD

Introductory-Various attributes-Early Representations and Date-Some birth-legends-Other Aspects.

Introductory

The history of the Elephant-faced God or Gaṇapati is fascinating and of an absorbing interest. Though not known during the proto-Indian period, he has still acquired a unique popularity as one of the sons of Śiva and Pārvatī.

We have already observed that originally the proto-Indian Triad consisted of Śiva, Ammā and Skanda, the proto-types of the historic Rudra-Śiva, Pārvatī and Skanda respectively. Evidently the notion of Gaṇapati must have come into vogue later on. Gaṇapati is not mentioned as the son of Śiva till the end of the Mahābhārata period. But after about the fifth century A. D. Gaṇapati becomes one of the most popular gods of the Indians.

Getty rightly observes, 'Gaṇeśa, Lord of the Gaṇas, although among the latest deities to be admitted to the Brāhmaṇic pantheon, was, and still is the most universally adored of all the Hindu Gods, and his image is found in practically every part of India. The popularity of Gaṇēśa extended to Nepal and Chinese Turkestan and crossed the seas to Java, Bali, and Borneo, while his worship was not unknown in Tibet, Burma, Siam, China, Indo-China, and Japan.[1]

Gaṇēśa seems to be merely an outcome of the exuberance and fanciful imagination of the later thinkers. However, many myths and legends have accumulated around this god, who is peculiarly enough endowed with cunning little fawn-coloured eyes, a huge trunk, uncouth looks, short arms, stunted legs, bulging girth, moon-crest, and a huge rat as his vehicle. As Getty points out, 'Obviously Gaṇēśa is linked with those stout, thickest goblins with which the earliest sculptures of ancient India have made us familiar, and that appear so often in the texts, now as the imps of Māra, the Buddhist Satan, now as the Yakṣas of Kubera, God of Wealth, now as the Rākṣasas of Kubera's brother Rāvaṇa, and sometimes of the Gaṇas of the 'King of Mountains,' Śiva. By their mis-shapen bodies, their guardianship of treasure-hoards, and by their freakish and too often evil characters, the gnomes of India (known under the various names ...such as Kumbhāṇḍa, Piśāca, Vetāla, etc.) are unquestionably the cousins, morally and physically, of the Scandinavian Trolls, the Celtic Korrigans, the Anglo-Saxon goblins, the German Kobolds, the Thraco-Phrygian Kabiri, not to mention the Arabian Jinn.'[2]

Various theories have been proposed by scholars in regard to the origin of this deity. Some believe that Gaṇeśa was originally a Dravidian deity worshipped by the aboriginal population of India who were Sun worshippers; and that Gaṇeśa on his *vāhana*, the rat, symbolized a Sun-God (overcoming the animal which in ancient

1. Getty, *Gaṇeśa*, p. 1.
2. *Ibid*, p. XV.

mythology, was a symbol of the night)'[1]. Others propose that he belongs to the animal cult.[2] Getty also endorses the same view-point while emphasizing that the original epithet Pilliar, meaning a young of an elephant (interpretation of Bagchi), indicates the elephant totem of a Dravidian tribe.[3]

But both the archæological data and the history of Gaṇapati clearly prove that he forms a combination of the varied elements and evidently not of any one single element, with the aid of which we can fix up his original character and position. Now let us examine some of the attributes of this deity.

I. *Some Attributes of Gaṇapati*

Ekadanta One of the names by which Gaṇapati is popularly styled is Ekadanta. The origin of this name can be easily traced to the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, wherein a mystic prayer is addressed to a god Dantin, 'He of the tusk (danta).'[4] This seems to refer to the Elephant-faced God, for the Mantra comes to a suite of *Mantras* addressed to two deities Kārttikeya and Nandī, the Bull.[5] Getty has made an interesting observation, namely, that, 'it seems natural that the one tusk of the Harvest Lord, which gave him his ancient name, should symbolically stand for the most important implement of the harvest, the plough, especially as the word *ekadanta* may be translated as 'One tusk', or plough share.'[6]

Vinayaka The expression Vināyaka occurs in Indian literature since a very early period. The Mahābhārata makes a mention of Gaṇeśvaras and Vināyakas as gods observing the actions of men and pervading everywhere.[7] In the same work, they are again described as removing all evil from men, when praised.[8] The *Mānava-gṛhya-sūtra* mentions four Vināyakas, namely, Śāla-kaṭaṅkaṭa, Kūṣmāṇ-ḍa-rājaputra, Usmita and Deva-yajña.[9] The *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* identifies Rudra with one Vināyaka. The *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti* describes the ceremony detailed in the above text. But it addresses only one Vināyaka, and enumerates six names, i.e. Mita, Sammita, Śāla, Kaṭaṅkaṭa, Kūṣmāṇḍa and Rājaputra.[10] Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has made an interesting remark, namely, that 'the difference between the two shows that during the period that had elapsed between the composition of the Sūtra and that of the Smṛti, the four Vināyakas had become one Gaṇapati-Vināyaka, having Ambikā for his mother; that in his own nature, this last god is an unfriendly or malignant spirit, but (like Rudra) capable of being made friendly and benignant by propitiatory rites; and that the cult of Gaṇapati-Vināyaka may already have been set up by the end of the sixth century A. D.' [11]

Ganesa or Ganapati Gaṇeśa is popularly known by the names Gaṇeśa and Gaṇapati respectively. Rudra was the father of the Maruts, who were called Gaṇas Further, Bṛhaspati or Brahmaṇaspati was called the Gaṇapati

1. *Ibid*, p. 1; cf. also Gubernatis, *Zoological Mythology*, II, p. 68.
2. Crooke, *op. cit.*, p. 287.
3. Getty, *op. cit.*, pp. 1 and 2.
4. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, X. 1. 5.
5. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Mahābhārata*, *Anuśāsana P.*, 151, 26.
8. *Ibid*, *Udyoga P.*, 37.
9. *Mānava G. S.*, II. 14.
10. *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, I, 271 ff.
11. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. Ś.*, p. 211.

(or lord of the hosts)[1] of the Gaṇas. The Gaṇeśvaras or Gaṇapatis are represented in the *Śatarudrīya*. The *Anuśāsana Parva* mentions the Gaṇeśvaras and Vināyakas amongst gods, and they are said to observe the actions of men and to be present everywhere.[2] *Yājñavalkya* describes that Rudra and Brahmadeva appointed Vināyaka to the leadership of the Gaṇas (cf. *supra*). Gaṇeśa or Gaṇeśāna as distinct from Śiva appears in the introduction to the North Indian recension of the *Mahābhārata*, wherein he is referred to as a scribe to the sage Vyāsa, writing down with superhuman rapidity his dictation of the *Mahābhārata*. The version is referred to in the *Bāla-Bhārata* (9th cen. A. D.). The Purāṇas often refer to Gaṇeśa in this capacity. He is referred to in the *Gāyatrī-Tantra* as writing down the Tantras to the dictation of his father Śiva. Winternitz opines that the legend was known long before the ninth Century A. D., and that it was not inserted into the introduction to the North Indian version of the Hindu Epic until 150 years later.[3]

But there is no evidence on record to prove the theory of Winternitz, as Ganapati is not at all referred to in the South Indian recension of the *Mahābhārata*, and as there is no evidence from Indian art and architecture. The only two paintings that depict the scene are the Nepalese and the Rajput respectively. 'The Nepalese miniature is in the *Piṅgalāmala*, a Tāntric manuscript of the thirteenth century A.D. –now in the Nepal State Library, wherein Gaṇeśa is seated cross-legged on the right with the right hand holding the broken tusk downward, as it were a stylus. The Rajput painting, which belongs to the seventeenth century, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, where Gaṇeśa is depicted four-armed standing before the worshipping Vyāsa, and the upper right hand corner is Brahmā at whose suggestion Vyāsa has appeared to Gaṇeśa.'[4]

We do not propose to enter here into the details of the other expressions like Sidhi-dātā, etc.

II. Date

We have already observed that the cult of Gaṇapati–Vināyaka must have come into vogue in about the 5th or the 6th century A. D. One need not believe, however, the version in regard to the tradition according to which Gaṇapati's worship was carried to Nepal in the third century B.C. by the daughter of the Buddhist king Aśoka.[5] Further even the reading of the characters as *Gaṇēśa* on a coin of Huvishka by Vincent Smith has been proved to be erroneous–the correct reading being *Bhavēśa*[6]. However, the famous Allahabad Pillar inscription (4th cen. A. D.) of the Gupta period refers to the extermination of one king Gaṇapati-Nāga at the hands of Samudra-Gupta.[7] There is, however, another inscription which belongs to a later period (about 862 A.D). The inscription as well as a relic are found at a place called Ghaṭiyāla, twenty-two miles north-west of Jodhpur. There is a column on the top of which are four images of Gaṇapati facing the four quarters. In the opening

1. *Ṛgveda*, II, 23. 1.
2. *Mahābhārata*, *Anuśāsana P.*, 151. 26, 57.
3. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 4; *J. R. A. S.*, 1898, p. 380.
4. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
5. Sastri, *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*, p. 168.
6. Cf. *J. A. S. B.*, I, 1897, p. 3.
7. Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 6.

sentence of the inscription engraved on it, an obeisance is made to Vināyaka[1]. Bhavabhūti in his famous work *Mālatī-Mādhava* refers to the Elephant-head of the God. The sculptural representations belonging to the same period also point to the popular vogue of the elephant-faced God.

It is worth noting that the Tāmiḷ works also throw sufficient light on the problem. It is said that, 'during the reign of the Pallava king Narasiṁhavarman, the son of Mahēndravarman I, Śiruttoṇḍar went back to his own village Tiruccengattan-guḍi, and began worshipping Śiva in the temple of Gaṇapati-ccaram, which is evidently the same as Gaṇapati. Even Appar refers to the sacred Elephant-faced God. The cult of Gaṇapati must have naturally come into vogue during the 5th century, after which alone it must have spread in the whole of India. (In regard to the transitional stages of the representations of Gaṇapati, cf. *infra*).

III. *The Gāṇapatya Sects and Philosophy*

Mainly on account of the influence of Śāktism, the cult of Gaṇapati assumed a unique position in Hinduism. Eventually, Gaṇēśa under the name of Ganapati became an important deity towards the tenth century A.D., when the Gāṇapatya sect set up the cult of five Śakti-Gaṇapatis called—Ucchiṣṭa-Gaṇapati, who was four-armed, and red in colour; Mahā-Gaṇapati, ten-armed and red; Ūrdhva-Gaṇapati, six-armed and yellow; Piṅgala-Gaṇapati, six-armed; Lakṣmī-Gaṇapati, four or eight-armed and white, while the Śakti is yellow and carries lotus.'[2]

Ānandagiri or Anantānandagiri, in his famous work *Śaṅkara-digvijaya*, refers to six varieties of the Gāṇapatya sects. The main tenets of these sects may be summarized as follows :

The Ganapatya Sects

' The first consists of those who adore Mahā-Gaṇapati. Mahā-Gaṇapati is, according to them, the creator, and he alone remains when Brahmadēva and others have been destroyed at the time of the dissolution. He should be meditated upon as possessed of his peculiar face with one tooth and as embraced by the Śakti. By his own wonderful power he creates Brahmadeva and others. One who repeats the original Mantra and meditates on this Gaṇapati attains supreme Bliss. The name of the person who expounds these doctrines to the Ācārya is given as Girijāsuta.

Another interlocutor follows. His name is Gaṇapati-kumāra, and he adores Haridrā-Gaṇapati. He takes his stand on *Ṛgveda*, II. 23. 1, and makes out this text to mean, "We meditate on thee who art the leader of the group of Rudra, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Indra and others, and art the instructor of sages like Bhṛgu, Guru, Śeṣa and others, the highest of all who know the sciences, the greatest Lord of the Brahmās engaged in the creation of the world *i.e.* adored by Brahman and others in the work of creation and others." He should be worshipped and meditated on as being dressed in a yellow silken garment, bearing a yellow sacred thread, having four arms, three eyes, and his face suffused over by turmeric ointment, and holding a noose and an elephant-goad and a staff in his hand. He worships the God in this form, and obtains emancipation.

1. *E. I.*, IX, pp. 277 ff.

2. Getty, *op. cit*, p. 20.

Gaṇapati is the cause of the whole world, and Brahmā and others are his parts. The worshipper of this Gaṇapati should bear on both of his arms the marks of Gaṇapati's face and one tooth impressed upon them by a heated iron stamp.

Then came Herambasuta, who was the worshipper of Ucchiṣṭa-Gaṇapati. The followers of this variety resort to the left-handed path (Vāma-mārga), which probably was set up in imitation of the Kaula worship of Śakti. The form of Gaṇapati meditated on is very obscene. There is no distinction of caste among the followers of this sect. No restriction is to be observed, such as marriage imposes, and promiscuous intercourse is allowed and also the use of wine. The follower should have a red mark on his forehead. All the ordinary ceremonies, such as twilight adorations (Sandhyā-vandana), are left to a man's own will.

The followers of the other three Gaṇapatis, i.e. Navanīta, Svarṇa and Saṃtāna, worship their god, they say, according to the Śruti. But since Gaṇapati is adored in the beginning of every religious act, he is the chief god and all the other gods are parts of him and should be worshipped as such. They regard the whole world as Gaṇapati and adore him as such.'[1]

The Gaṇapati Upaniṣad

The followers of Gaṇapati in general also developed a philosophical system of their own. We are giving a survey of the *Gaṇapati Upaniṣad* which forms part of the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad*:

'Praise be to thee, O Gaṇapati! Thou art manifestly the truth; thous art undoubtedly the creator, the preserver, and destroyer; thou art certainly Brahmā, the eternal spirit. I speak what is right and true: preserve me...when speaking, when listening, when giving, when possessing, when teaching, when learning, when in the west, the east, the north, or the south, when above or below; continually protect me everywhere. Thou art in essence speech, intellect, and divine knowledge; thou art manifestly the adualistic and universal spirit, by which this universe was produced, is preserved, and shall be destroyed. By these was this universe manifested; for thou art earth, water, fire, air, and ether; thou art the three qualities, three kinds of bodies (divine, human and irrational), the three times, and the three energies; and on thee do Yogīs continually meditate. Thou art Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra; thou art Indra, Agni, Vāyu, Sūrya and Soma. *Om, bhūr, svar, gam,* praise be to thee, O Gaṇapati! We acknowledge thy divinity, O Ekadanta! and meditate on thy countenance; enlighten, therefore, our understandings. He who continually meditates upon thy divine form, conceiving it to be with one tooth with four hands (one holding a noose and an Aṅkuśa, another a tooth, and the other as if granting a boon), bearing a rat on thy banner of a red hue, with a large belly, annointed with red perfumes, arrayed in red garments, worshipped with offerings of red flowers, abounding in compassion, the cause of this universe, imperishable, unproduced, and unaffected by creation, becomes the most excellent of Yogīs. Praise, therefore, be to thee, O Gaṇapati! the destroyer of difficulties, the son of Śiva, the grantor of boons to thy votaries. Whoever meditates upon this picture of the *Atharvaśiras*, never will he be impeded by difficulties; his happiness will increase; he will be liberated from the

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. Ś.*, pp. 212-14.

five great sins, and all lesser ones : and he will acquire riches, the objects of his desires, virtue and final beatitude. Except to a pupil, this portion of the *Atharvaśiras* must not be communicated to another, and whoever communicates it to one spiritually blind shall incur sin; but whoever meditates upon it shall attain his every will. Whoever, also, on the fourth of each half month, repeats it fasting, shall acquire eloquence and learning.'[1]

IV. Some Birth Legends of Gaṇapati

The Purāṇas detail various accounts regarding the birth of Gaṇapati. We propose to detail here a few of them.[2]

(1) Śiva, while trying to safeguard the interest of the Dēvas fell into deep meditation, and while immersed in perfound thought a great brilliance emanated from his forehead (*Varāha P.*); and there sprang into existence a woodrous being endowed with all the qualities of Śiva. When the Goddess Umā (Pārvatī) saw the surprisingly beautiful youth whom Śiva had created of his own will and without her participation, she uttered the following curse: 'May thy head resemble that of an elephant and thy body be deformed by a huge belly.'

(2) The *Varāha P.* describes another legend : Śiva, after listening to the supplications of Indra and the minor gods, replied that he was unable to grant their request, for having given his promise to his faithful followers worshipping at his shrine of Somēśvara, it could not be withdrawn. But, he suggested, why not appeal to the Goddess Pārvatī, his consort, who might find some means of extricating them from the present predicament ? Then Indra beseeched Pārvatī for aid. Pārvatī, moved with compassion, brought into existence a creator of obstacles (Vighnēśvara). But legends differ as to the mode of creation. The *Skānda P.* has it, that after gently rubbing her body Pārvatī produced a youth with four arms and the head of an elephant. Again according to another account : Taking the unguents with which she annointed herself, Pārvatī mixed with them the impurities from her body ; and repairing to the mouth of the sacred river Ganges where dwelt the elephant-headed Rākṣasī Mālinī, she offered her the portion. The Rākṣasī accepted the unguents, and after drinking them she gave birth to a male child with five elephant-heads. Pārvatī claimed the child as her offspring and Śiva, accepting him as the son of Pārvatī, willed the five heads to be one and proclaimed him 'Remover of obstacles'. The *Matsya P.* narrates that with the oil and ointment used in her bath, she formed, with the impurities of her body, the image of a youth with the face of an elephant ; and sprinkling the image with water from the sacred Ganges, it sprang into life. Whereupon, Pārvatī turning to Indra and the gods explained that she had created this wondrous being for the sole purpose of putting obstacles in the path of all those who wished to worship at the shrine of Śiva, and 'thus shall they fall into the seven hells.'

1. Trans. by Kennedy, *Hindu Mythology*, pp. 493–94.

2. Cf. *Skānda*, *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, *Dharmāraṇya-khaṇḍa*, 12, 18; VII (3), Adh. 31; *Brahmavaivarta P. Gaṇeśa-khaṇḍa* (3), Adh, 14; *Varāha*, 32,7. *Bṛhad-dharma*, *Madhyama-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 60. All the following accounts are adopted from Getty's *Gaṇeśa*.

The *Brahmavaivarta P.* states that, 'Pārvatī in despair at having no offspring from Śiva undertook to perform the *Pāṇyaka-vrata* or worship of Śiva which consisted in making offering of flowers, fruits, etc. at his shrine daily for a year. But although she faithfully accomplished the prescribed rites, she remained childless. One day, plunged in deep grief, because her request had remained ungranted, she heard a voice from the heavens telling her to go to her private apartments where she would find her son (who was in reality a manifestation of Kṛṣṇa). Great was her joy on hearing the message; and repairing to her private apartments she found a beautiful youth whom she and Śiva accepted as their son. In honour of the event they invited all the gods to a great feast for the purpose of looking upon the wondrous youth. Śani (Saturn) was the only god who kept his eyes fixed persistently on the ground. Pārvatī reproached him with this and bade him gaze upon her beautiful son. Hardly had he raised his eyes when the head of the youth separated from his body and disappeared into Goloka, the heaven of Kṛṣṇa. The gods in despair threw themselves on the ground weeping and waiting at the disaster, but Viṣṇu, mounting on Garuḍa, his *vāhana*, flew away to the river Puṣpabhadrā, where he found an elephant asleep with its head twined to the north; and cutting off the head, he flew back again and placed it on the headless child (Bāla-Ganeśa), who sprang into life to the great joy of Śiva, Pārvatī and the host of Gods.

Some of the other accounts relate that the elephant, whose head was cut off by Viṣṇu, was the son of Indra's *vāhana*, while other legends give Indra's mount itself, namely, the elephant Airāvata.

There is another interesting account given : Śiva said, 'I in company with Pārvatī once retired to the forest on the slopes of the Himālaya to enjoy each other's company when we saw a female elephant making herself happy with a male elephant. This excited our passion and we decided to enjoy ourselves in the form of elephants. I became a male elephant and we pleased ourselves; as a result you were born with the face of an elephant.'[1]

V. *Some aspects of Gaṇapati*

We propose to detail here some of the most important aspects of Gaṇapati.

Names

The various names by which Ganapati is described in the Sanskrit literature are as follows: Vakra-tuṇḍa, Ekadanta, Vināyaka, Gaṇapati, Vighneśvara, Ākhuratha, Siddhi-dātā, Heramba, Dvidehaka, Lambōdara, Gajānana, Bāla-Gaṇapati, etc. His designations in other languages are : *Pillaiyar* (Tāmiḷ), *tsogs-bdag bgegs med pai po* (Tibetan), *Mahā-pienne* (Burmese), *Totkhai-oun khaghan* (Mongolian), *Preh Kene's* (Cambodian), *Kuan-shi Tie n* (Chinese) and *Shoten*, *Vinayākṣa*, *Kwanzan-sho*, and *Kangi-ten* (Japanese).

Ganapati in Literature and Art

Gaṇapati figures in the various mystic and magic texts both Brahmanic and Buddhist, from the fifth century onwards.[2] He very frequently occurs in the Stotra literature *i.e.* one of the hymns found in the Tandjur addresses him as the Great Hero, conqueror of Māra,

1. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 5 ff. 2. *Ibid*, p. 8.

without equal, incomparable, great magician, king of incantations, master of secret formulæ.[1] Further the *Gaṇapati Upaniṣad* forms part of the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad*. There is again a separate work called *Gaṇeśā-Gītā*.

Getty gives an interesting description: Ganapati was invoked in Tāntric Sādhanas or mystic formulæ for the invocation of a deity when he was to be visualized with three eyes and many arms and in forms unknown in paintings or sculptures, such as in the *Sarva-durgati-pariśodhana*, where as Vajra-Gaṇapati, he is described as holding a *Vajra* and a sword, and as seated on a toad instead of his usual rat. He is often found in Dhāraṇīs, that is magic charms or spells where, as in the *Śaradā-tilaka-Tantra*, he is associated with triangles and circles. There are other Dhāraṇīs where he is referred to as being ignominously trodden under foot by the Goddess Aparājitā or by other Gods and Goddesses. Mantras were addressed to him. And like the other Tāntric gods, he was allotted a Vīja (a mystic syllable Gaṇ - गं).[2]

However, the Tantras ordain that no secret of the Tāntric mysteries may be revealed to him. In the Kula rites of initiation, for instance, Gaṇēśa was first supplicated to remove all obstacles to the success of initiation, after which he was invited to depart.[3]

Gaṇapati is closely associated with different groups of deities i. e. the Navagrahas (the Nine Planets), and the Sapta-mātṛkās. He has to be invoked first. Getty observes that his association with the Sapta-mātṛkās seems to be of a later date. The most frequent representations of the Sapta-mātṛkās occur in Cālukyan art-in the Cennakēśava Temple at Belūr, in the temple of Kāśī-Viśvēśvara at Lakkuṇḍi, in the rock-cut caves at Ellora, etc. The most famous Navagraha slab was found near the ancient ruins of Kaṅkaṇdighi, and where the images are represented as standing in a row with Gaṇeśa (standing next to the sun on the extreme right), at the right wearing the high Jaṭā-mukuṭa of Śiva and carrying a rosary and battle-axe. Some of such slabs are to be found in the Orissan temples also.[4]

According to the *Mahānirvāṇa-T.*, 'Gaṇēśa should be first worshipped in ceremonies of initiation and consecration of tanks, wells, and images of deities; and is to be meditated upon according to the *dhyāna*, as 'being vermillion of colour, as having three eyes, a large belly, as holding in his lotus-hands the conch-shell, noose, elephant goad, and as making the sign of blessing. On his forehead shines the moon. Then the worshipper offers the *pañca-tattva* to Gaṇeśa and worships the Divine Mothers and others afterwards.'

The name of Ganapati's wife is described as Puṣṭi. His Śaktis are believed to be the same as the Aṣṭasiddhis or the eight Goddesses believed to preside over Success and Achievement. There is a shrine dedicated to Gaṇēśa at Kirtipur in Nepal where the eight goddesses are represented.

Gaṇapati is given thirty-two different appellations in the *Mudgala Purāṇa*. The *Śaradā-tilaka* gives a list of fifty-one Dhāraṇas and describes the different aspects of Gaṇapati.

1. *Ibid.* 2. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 8. 3. *Ibid*, p. 9.
4. *Ibid*, p. 29; cf. also *I. H. Q.*, IX, No. 1.

Gaṇeśa has become prominent as one of the five great Brahmin Gods. He, as Vināyaka, is adored by all while embarking on any enterprise ; and as Vighneśa is invoked at the beginning of every book to ensure literary success. Getty has detailed the following information : 'His image is placed in the site of a future construction and a pūjā (worship) with offerings of flowers, to gain his benign guardianship. As popular legend gave him the reputation of robbing pious worshippers of the fruit of their devotions if not properly propitiated, he was always invoked before beginning the devotion. In South India he is a popular household God and is familiarly adored as Pilliyar. He is invoked the first of all the gods at the morning ablutions and again at noon and before sleeping at night ; and he is often worshipped in company with four other Great Gods of the Pañcāyatana. Before him was a pile of Modakas, generally five in number called Pañcapiṇḍa. Sometimes, instead of being imaged, the five Brāhman Gods are represented by five consecrated pebbles : Visnu, a black pebble ; Śiva, a white quartz ; Pārvatī, a metallic stone ; Āditya, a crystal ; and Gaṇeśa, a red stone. [1]

It is also worth noting that it is described that there is a mountain in the shape of an elephant called Vinataka in Jambudvīpa. This was confused with Vināyaka ; and the result of which was that in every Buddhist country where there was a hill or mountain which was vaguely in the form of the head of an elephant, the worship of Gaṇeśa was set up and a place of pilgrimage established. [2]

Gaṇapati is depicted in Indian art *e. g.* sculpture, painting, etc. He is represented with one, two, three, four or five heads, and his tusks range from one to three in number. Generally, the images of Gaṇeśa have two eyes, but on Tāntric statues and when invoked in Tāntric *dhyānas* he has a third eye. He is designated as Bhālacandra as there is a *tilaka*, or the crescent moon, on his forehead. He is also depicted with three horizontal lines painted white on his forehead. He holds a conch-shell. Generally a second girdle of snakes is tied around his belly. Getty observes that, 'with the growing influence of the Tantras and the popularity of Śāktism, Gaṇeśa was imaged, as were the other gods, in company with his female counterpart whom he was represented holding with his left arm, either beside him or on his left lap. The Devī, as a rule, had her right arm around his neck, while the left held the bowl of *batāsas*.'[3] He is called in Tāmiḷ as Valamburi when the trunk is turned to the left.

In the *Gaṇeśa Purāṇa* he is symbolized by a *Cintāmaṇi*.[4] In the Mahāyāna Buddhism it is the magic jewel interpreted, in the esoteric doctrine, as symbolizing the germ of life. There are dhyānas in the *Śāradā-tilaka-Tantra* where Gaṇeśa is associated with triangles, rectangles, etc.[5] Gaṇeśa is depicted as the carrier of the pomegranate, which has at all times, according to Goblet d Alviella, been considered an emblem of fertility, of abundance of life.[6] He generally holds the *Modaka* and axe.

1. *Ibid*, pp. 11ff; cf. also Sastri, *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*.
2. *Ibid*, p. 23.
3. *Ibid*, pp. 10ff.
4. Stevenson, 'Analysis of the Gaṇeśa Purāṇa,' *J. R. A. S.*, VIII, 1845, p. 319.
5. Getty, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.
6. Goblet d Alviella, *La Migration des Symboles*, p. 184; quoted by Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

Gaṇapati is popularly worshipped in the form of a formless stone called Svayambhū-mūrti. Three of such stones are to be found in Kashmir.[1] During the later period separate temples were erected in honour of Gaṇapati alone, with his *Vāhana*, the rat, guarding the entrance to the temple of Śiva. There is a rock-cut temple of Gaṇeśa near Trichinopoly known as *Ucchi-pillayar Kovil.*[2]

Ganapati in Buddhism

Gaṇapati was also a popular God of the Buddhists. The Buddhists claimed that a mystic *mantra* in praise of Gaṇēśa, called the *Gaṇapati-hṛdaya*, was disclosed to Ānanda by the Buddha himself at Rājagṛha. This *mantra* was eventually personified in the form of a goddess named Gaṇapati-hṛdaya, who, according to Bhattacharya, was probably looked upon as the Śakti of Gaṇēśa. While invocating, this deity is to be conceived as being of red hue, standing in a dancing attitude, as having twelve arms holding Tāntric symbols, and as possessed of a third eye as well as of both his tusks[3]. It is interesting to note that the Tibetans conceived a female as well as a male form of Gaṇēśa.[4]

Some Early Representations

Before the creation of the Bhūmāra sculptures the image of Gaṇēśa must have undergone many transitional forms. On one of the Amarāvatī railings (about 1st cen. B. C.) is represented a personage crouching under the weight of a long, serpent-shaped garland (a 'sack of rupees' according to J. Dubreuil), upheld at intervals by other Gaṇas. 'Only a part of the body is left, but enough remains to show that the *gaṇa* is short and of the usual Yakṣa corpulence. The head is unquestionably that of an elephant, that is, the eyes, ears, and the lower lip ; but as the image has neither trunk nor tusk, it is questionable whether it is really a proto-type of Gaṇēśa.' There is again a frieze of Gaṇas in the style of those of Amarāvati, in Ceylon near Mīhintale. There is again a small terra-cotta bas-relief, which was found at the ancient site of Akra. It is probably of the pre-Gupta period. Even so some images are found at Parkarhar. All these reliefs represent Gaṇēśa 'in a dancing attitude, holding a round object that may be a Modaka. There is again a direct representation of Gaṇēśa found in the Fatehgarh District, which is believed to have come originally from Saṅkisā mound. 'Here Gaṇeśa is carved on a slab of spotted stone in high relief. The bare head with huge ears is abnormally large, while the nude torso is too short for the length of the arms. The trunk, unlike the Indian representations, where it hangs straight and only coils to the left to reach the bone, turns almost at once to the left and then hangs straight to the bowl.' There are also very beautiful representations of Gaṇapati at Bhūmāra belonging to about the 5th or 6th cen. A. D.

It is worth noting that in China and Japan Gaṇapati is represented in the double aspect of Ardha-nārīśa.[5]

The image of Gaṇapati was also placed at the entrances to temples in the Dekkan, and over the main entrances to the Vihāras and temples in Nepal and West

1. Getty, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–23. 2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid*, p. 36. 4. *Ibid*, p. 43.
5. *Cf. Ibid*, pp. 27 ff. for the above information.

Tibet. Again there is an ancient column at Gaṭiyāla, near Jodhpur, containing an inscription (8th cen. A. D.) and the image of Gaṇapati.

We need not enter into the other myths detailed in the Purāṇas in regard to Gaṇapati, e.g. his conflict with Paraśurāma and others. Gaṇapati is popularly worshipped on the Gaṇēśa-Caturthī, which falls on the fourth day of Bhādrapada. We cannot, however, end this brief survey of the shrewd mighty elephant-faced God without quoting the remark of Sylvain Lévi, who says: 'His strange but good-natured physiognomy arrests our attention as well as our symapthy.'[1]

1. Sylvain Lévi, *Nepal* I, pp. 383–4; Getty, *op. cit.*, XXIII.

CHAPTER IX

PROTO-INDIAN ZOOLATRY

Introductory – Fish – Nāga – Cow – Bull – Hanumān – Tiger Boar – Lion – Dog – Peacock – Other animals.

I. GENERAL NOTIONS

Introductory

Both the proto-Indian relics and the later literary and artistic traditions of India present before us a unique phase in regard to the origin and development of animal-worship in ancient India. The skeletal remains and the various representations on the seals and pottery found on the proto-Indian sites show a keen knowledge of those people in regard to the following animals: 'humped bull' or Zebu (*Bos Indicus*), the buffalo (*Bos bubalus*), sheep, elephant (*Elephas maximus*), camel (*Camelus dromedarius*), pig (*Sus cristatus*), fowl (*Gallus sp*.), dog; wild animals like Mungoose (*Herpestes auropunctatus*), the shrew (*Crocidura bidiana*), the black rat (*Mus rattus*), and four kinds of deer, *viz.* the Kashmir stag (*Cervus Cashmerianus*), the sambhar (*Cervus unicolor*), spotted deer (*Cervus axis*), the *gaur* or Indian bison, the rhinoceros, the tiger, the monkey, the bear, the hare, and the fish or fishes.[1]

Marshall made an emphatic statement that the animals represented fall into three classes, *viz.* (*a*) those of a definitely mythical character; (*b*) those whose mythical character is questionable; and (*c*) those belonging to natural species. To suit the purposes of this remark, he observes, that the first class consists of various kinds of therianthropic beasts *e. g.* human-faced goat or ram, or part goat and ram, part bull and part man, or the more complex forms such as part ram or part goat, part bull and part elephant with human countenance (figured on seals 378, 380, and 381 and apparently represented also in the stone images in the round illustrated in Pl. c, 7 and 9), and a three-faced figure consisting of the three heads of a bison, a unicorn and an ibex respectively; the second consists of the 'unicorns,' the two-horned animals and others; and finally the third comprises the water buffalo (*Bos babulus*) the *gaur* or Indian bison (*Bos gaurus*), the Indian humped bull or zebu (*Bos Indicus*), the Indian rhinoceros (*Rhinoceres unicornis*), a short-horned humpless bull, the tiger (*Felis tigris*), and the Indian elephant (*Elephas maximus*).[2] He is also of opinion that animal worship was in full vogue during the proto-Indian period.

But all the data available to us at present does not show any sign in regard to a full development of animal worship during this early period. No doubt we have evidence to the effect that the fish or the ram, which were the forms of God Śiva, were worshipped in those days. And a due veneration seems to have been shown towards the Nāga, as it happened to be an emblem of Śiva. The Supreme deities of the Mohenjo Darians were Śiva, Mūruga, Ammā, and others. And eventually all the animals must be taken to play a subordinate role.

1. Marshall. *Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization*, I.pp. 27-29.
2. *Ibid.*

Moreover, there is no indication of totem worship amongst the proto-Indians. They seem to have passed that stage. Sometimes the animals represented them (especially in the representation of Paśupati) indicate the *Lāñcchanas* of the particular tribes ruling over the different parts of India.[1] The essential feature of a totemistic community as conceived by S. Reinach assumes that the men and women of that community conceive themselves severally to be related to some animal or plant or other thing, and that they normally treat that plant or animal with great care and respect, only on special occasions in the case of an animal or plant destroying it in the course of a formal meal, in which they enter into communion among themselves and with the god, through devouring the representative of the god; the species and the mere animals being sacred, as soon as one animal is killed, another takes place.[2] There are also other alternate theories, namely, those which propound that totemism is derived from ancestor-worship and metem-psychosis,[3] or is economic *au foud*,[4] or originates from the desire of the savage, at the time of puberty in connection with the new birth which he then undergoes, to provide himself with a safe resting place[5] for the external soul, or from his ignorance of the true nature of conception.

The proto-Indian representations or documents do not show any such belief in regard to animals. Even though they speak of the Fish or the Ram God or even of the combination of the two (cf. *infra*), still they treat them merely as the forms of God Śiva himself. They have hardly anything to do with totemism.

That some of the figures of animals indicate the Royal *Lāñcchanas* is corroborated by the statement in the *Pampa Rāmāyaṇa* in Kannaḍa, which specifically states that the Vānaras were so called, not because they were actually monkeys, but because they had the figure of the monkey on their banner.[6] Thus, this totally sets at rest theviews put forth by the advocates of 'totemism' in ancient India. That such a systemof using heraldic device was in vogue in proto-India becomes clear from the representation of the standard-bearers. Mr. Hargreaves describes the three-sided prism of faience found at Mohenjo Daro thus: "On the front face is a procession of four standard bearers, only their heads and shoulders visible. Two of the ensigns on the standards (the first and the last) are indistinct, but the second from the left is a bull, and recalls the ensigns of the 'Bull' gnomes of Early Egypt–ensigns which went back to pre-dynastic times. The third standard is also reminiscent of the Lybian Ostrich feather".[7]

Evidently the idea of the independent worship of animals seems to have come into vogue at a later stage. The various legends depicted in the Purāṇic and other works regarding the story of the Fish or the Nāga acting as the ancestor of a

1. Heras, *MSS.*
2. S. Reinach, *Cultus, Myths et Religiones*, i, 9–29, 41 ff.; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, I, p. 195.
3. Wundt, *Elemente der Volkarpsychologie*, pp. 173 ff. Keith, *op. cit.* I, p. 195.
4. Hopkins, *op. cit., loc. cit;* Keith, *op. cit.* I, *loc. cit.*
5. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, IV, 52 ff.
6. Cf. under *Hānumān or Monkey-God.* 7. *Memoirs, A.S.I., No.* 30, Pl III, fig. 9.

particular king or a clan must act as merely imaginative and of a later date. As against the theory of Oldenberg,[1] we may say that even the taboos like the wearing of an antelope-skin, etc. need not be regarded as throwing light on the problem of the existence of totemism in ancient India.

II. THE FISH

Fish and Siva-Fish as a heraldic device-Fish whether a totem originally-Fish as a fertility symbol-Matsyāvatāra of Viṣṇu.

The fish played an important role in the cultural life of the proto-Indians. The Mīnas or the later Matsyas derived their tribal name from that of the 'fish' (Mīna), which probably happened to be their heraldic device. The fish formed one of the constellations of the Mohenjo Daro Zodiac. It was identified with the eye of God. In fact Śiva and Ammā were designated as Mīnkaṉ and Mīnkaṇṇi respectively. The fish played an important part in the socio-religious life of the Hindus, Buddhists and others during the later period.

(a). *The Indus Valley Period*

During the Mohenjo Daro period the most popular of all the forms of God was the fish. The fish formed one of the eight constellations of the Mohenjo Daro zodiac. One of the inscriptions refers to the Supreme Being of the Ram and the Fish of Naṇḍur[2]-thus showing that the God of Naṇḍur was a combination of the Ram and the Fish. The representation on the above seal contains the following details: an enormous ram, larger than the human figures represented in it, having the head of a fish and bearing the horns over the fish's head. Yet the seal itself seems to show that it is only a form of God—a symbol or a representation-for on the upper corner of the seal the figure of God is represented standing in the middle of a tree, with the trident on his head, after the fashion of the seal.[3]

Siva as Fish-eyed

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions generally describe Śiva as 'Fish-eyed'—'which is a quality considered as a beauty note in Indian æsthetics'. In one of the inscriptions it is said 'three fish eyes', thus directly referring to the Supreme Being. In another it is described, 'the eyes of the Great Fish.'[4]

The Puranic Corroboration

The Purāṇic data, however, wonderfully corroborates with what is stated in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions. The *Skānda Purāṇa* refers to the close connection of the constellation of the Fish and Śiva. In one of its passages, Śiva is addressed as: 'To Mīna or the Lord of the Mīna (or Mīnas)'. Further the *Vāmana Purāṇa* states, that 'the two fishes are said to have been located in the ocean, in every country, and in the house of the Gods and Brahmins[6]'.

1. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 82 ff.
2. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 42.
3. Heras, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.
4. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 68.
5. *Skānda P.*, *Māheśvara Kh.*, Adh. 17.
6. *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 5,59.

The Purāṇas have again thrown light on the problem in regard to the early association of the Fish with God Śiva. The *Kālikā Purāṇa* states that, 'Kāma, after he was restored to life, again installed the image of the fish-form of God Śiva on the Maṇikūṭa Mountain in Assam'.[1] *The Skānda Purāṇa* describes that, 'at Ṛṣi-tīrtha and another place just adjacent to it (both at Prabhāsa), there are three-eyed *Matsyas* or fish, and that they can be seen in this fashion even to this day.'[2] In another passage of the same Purāṇa, it is related that, 'once some sages practised penance and that they prayed Śiva (Śūlin) for bringing the Ganges to Prabhāsa. Śiva did so. And the sages saw the Ganges (in the Tīrtha) as being full of fishes, which became three-eyed immediately they were perceived. The sages then requested God saying, 'In our Kuṇḍa (holy pond) let there be fishes always, and they be three-eyed in all the forth-coming Yugas.'[3] The same Purāṇa narrates another account: Once upon a time, in moments of utter distress and calamity, the Ṛsis or sages prayed and adored Narmadā, upon which a goddess appeared smiling in a dream, and said, 'Do not be afraid', and disappeared. Next day the sages saw the fishes coming along with their members (*parivārah*) near their huts or *āśramas*. All the sages felt happy'.[4] In the *Viṣṇudharmottara P.* it is stated that the Fish was worshipped in the country of the Matsyas,[5] and in Kashmir.[6]

Some other Traditions

The recent excavations at Rairh (Jaipur State) have supplied us with two interesting examples. In one of the representations, the mother-Goddess is painted red and stands full front carrying a pair of fish in her right hand while the left hip is seen holding the girdle.[7] Again one of the pottery plaques 'represents a female and a male figure standing full front. The crowned female figure which is taller than the male stands to his right with her hand placed on the head of the young man as if in the act of benedicting. The male figure whose right hand is on the hip of the female figure is seen holding a pair of fish in his left hand, an emblem usually seen in the hand of the Mother Goddess (Pl. XIII, d.)'.[8]

There is also another instance in current tradition. It is stated that at Nerenika in the Bellary District there is a temple dedicated to Mallesvara near which is a cave where a crude carving of a rock into something like the caricature of a fish is worshipped.[9]

(b). *Fish as a Heraldic Device*

The symbol of the two fishes or the horned fish (Kombu Mīna) formed the heraldic device or *Lāñcchana* of many of the ruling tribes or dynasties in proto- and ancient India. In the Mohenjo Daro period, probably the Mīnas adopted it, though the unicorn formed their earlier *Lāñcchana*.[10] Later on the Fish *Lāñcchana*

1. *Kālikā P.*, Adh. 82, 50-52.
2. *Skānda P.*, VII, 1, Adh. 255, 2; 275, 1-2.
3. *Ibid*, Adh. 30. 1 ff.
4. *Ibid*. V, 3, Adh. 13.
5. *Viṣṇudharmottara P. Khaṇḍa* III.
6. *Ibid*, *Third Khaṇḍa*, Adh. 121, 3.
7. *Excavation at Rairh, Arch. Dept.*, Jaipur, p. 28.
8. *Ibid*, p. 30.
9. Moses, 'Fish and Religion in South India', *Q. J. M. S.*, XIII, p. 551.
10. Photo *M. D.*, 1930-31, No. 3987.

was adopted by the Bilavas, Eṭkalis, the Kāvals (whose *Lāñcchana* was the Liṅga originally), Kalakilas and Paravas, who bore the title of Mīnavan. When a union between the various tribes used to take place all the heraldic devices of different tribes were depicted together, i.e. the Union of the Mīnas, Bilavas and and Eṭkalis is seen represented on one of the seals[1]. Father Heras observes that, 'the seal which bears this inscription has likewise the figure of an animal with three heads: of a unicorn, of a bull and of an ibex; the unicorn of the Mīnas, the bull of the Bilavas, and the ibex of the Eṭkalis'[2]. To cite a mythological incident or two. It is said in one of the passages of the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, that when the fight ensued between Lalitādēvī and the Rākṣasas, there were various kinds of flags depicted with the symbols of the Fish, Serpents, etc.[3] Kāma is designated in mythology as Mīnadhvaja. The first mythical descendant of Hanumān is called in the bardic list as Makaradhvaja.[4] The heraldic device of the two fishes was adopted by the Pāṇḍyas of Madura, on account of which they were designated as *Mīnavar Kon.* It is also worth noting that the Royal House of the Pāṇḍyas was built in a fish-shaped fashion.[5] The royal *Lāñcchana* of the Matsya dynasty of Oddadi consisted of the Fish.[6] The Kadambas of Kaliṅga adopted this symbol.[7]

(c). *Fish as a Fertility Symbol*

One of the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions refers to the 'Spring Fish.' Father Heras observes that the term might have been used to denote the symbol of fertility of God, who is specially seen in the Spring.[8] This is corroborated by some of the later representations also.

In the Kailāsa temple at Ellora, the topmost of the three tableau contains the following representation: above the inverted stem of the lotus, ending at either end in a lotus bud and a flower combined in one stem, there are two other stems of lotus branches, turned upwards on either side encircling, as it were, two fishes combining in arch-like fashion at their mouths, which are about to touch each other, as if they were kissing, and in between them, in the intervening, is a full-blown lotus, the lower portion of whose stalk passes just between the space intervening the tails of the two fishes is the emblem of the Liṅga, rather rounded in form on a *paṇivatta*, at each end of which is again a lotus. Above the Liṅga is a smaller Liṅga, and above it a still smaller one, and above these three successive Liṅgas. The Triśūla is again shown, worked out in a manner, quite in keeping with the heraldic details of the sculpture.[9]

Hayavadan Rao proposes that this may be the representation of Śiva in his Sāttvic aspect i.e. that of Viṣṇu, the Preserver of universe.[10] But, as we know, the

1. Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the People and the Land', *Indian Culture*, III, No. 4.
2. *Ibid*, p. 112.
3. *Brahmāṇḍa P., Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 23, 24.
4. *Statistical Account of Porbunder*, p. 14 f.
5. Sewell. *A Sketch of the Dynasties of South India*, 1883, p. 74.
6. Moses, *op. cit.*, *E. I.*, V., 106; *J. A. H. R. S.*, V, Pl. II, No. 4.
7. *J. B. and O. R. S.*, XVIII, p. 175.; *J. B. H.S.*, V, *fasc.* p. 28.; *J. A. H. R. S.* III, p 171; IV, p. 113.
8. Marshall, M.D., No. 111, Photo, *M.D.*, 1929-30., No. 8222; *M.D.*, No. 405; *ibid*, H, No. 89.
9. *Mysore Gaz.* II, Pt.I, pp 156-157.
10. *Ibid*, p. 157.

fish was closely associated with Śiva in ancient times; and it was considered as a symbol of fertility. The three Liṅgas are the three aspects of the Supreme Lord. The lotus also is a symbol of fertility. Thus, evidently, the present design represents a tradition–a far ancient tradition, namely, that of the Fish as a fertility symbol.

The tradition is retained in another way i. e. it is said to represent the *yoni* or ovarian fertility. It is comprised in the five-fold Makara, which 'taketh away all sin' of the Vāmācāris, the left-hand Śāktas, in its representative capacity of a symbol of ovarian fertility. Some other examples come from the South. The Holeyars of Canara lead the newly wedded couple to a river where they put in the wedding mat woven by the bride and catch some fish which the couple let go after kissing[1]. In some cases one fish is taken home and its scales adorn the forehead of the couple and they believe that this ensures their fertility[2].

(d) *Fish: Whether originally a Totem*

It has become a debatable point whether the fish happened to be a totem of any tribe in ancient India. We may safely say that the proto-Indian period does not show any sign of the prevalence of the idea. The *Mahābhārata* relates the story of king Matsya, who is said to have been born from the womb of a fish along with Matsyagandhā Satyavatī[3]. The *Harivaṁśa* asserts that Girikā through Gaidya Uparicara gave birth to seven children i. e. Mahāratha Magadharāṭ Bṛhadratha, Pratyājaha, Kuśa, whom they called as Maṇivāhana, Marutta, Yadu, Matsya and Kālī[4]. The story of Pradyumna's birth from the womb of the fish is well-known. The Matsyas of Oddadi relate a story as follows:

'In the lineage of Kaśyapa was the sage Nāraṅga, who, one day while wandering in the sky saw the river Matsyā which rises on the Mukunda mountain, and descending its banks he engaged himself in penance. The frieghtened Indra, in order to disturb the sage in his divinity destroying plan, sent down the Apsarā and Mañjughoṣa. But the sage's curse changed her into a fish Matsyā, and made her to swallow the semen which the ascetic had thrown into the water. She in due course gave birth to a son who was called Satya-Mārtaṇḍa. Jayatsena of Utkala gave the boy a governorship and his daughter[5].'

Macdonell observed that there are possibly in the *Ṛgveda* some survivals of totemism, or the belief in the descent of the human race or of individual tribes of families from animals or plants[6]. He cites in this connection the instance of the 'Matsya' occurring in the *Ṛgveda*. But as has been observed in the beginning, the Matsyas seem to have obtained their tribal name 'Mīna' mostly an account of their sea-faring activity. The Mīna or the Matsya was also their heraldic symbol. In view of all this, all the later accounts seem to be utterly fabulous.

1. Moses, *op. cit.*, *Q. J. M. S.*, XIII, P. 554. 2. *Ibid.*
3. *Mahābhārata Adi. P.*, Adh. 57.
4. *Harivaṁśa*, i, 32, 91-93; cf. also *Brahmāṇḍa P. Madhyabhāga*, Adh 10, 67.
5. *E. I.* V, p. 106. 6. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 153.

(e). *Fish in Later Religion and Art*

The fish as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu is worshipped on various occasions. Many of the finny tribes of the Ganges are worshipped at the festivals in honour of the Goddess Gaṅgā. Female Hindus residing on the banks of the Padmā, on the fifth of the increase of the moon in Māgha, actually worship the Ilishu fish, and afterwards partake of them without the fear of injuring their health. Pious Hindus feed fish at sacred places with a lakh or more little balls of flour, wrapped up in Bhūrja-patra or birch-bark or paper with the name of Rāma written on it. Their eating the name of the deity ensures their salvation, and confers religious merit on the givers. There are special ponds reserved for fishes in front of many temples in India.

The fish is a sign of good luck. Its pictures are always drawn on housewalls as a charm against demoniacal influence. There is a widespread belief in Śriṅgerī that skin diseases can be cured by propitiating the fish of this place.[1] In the Naulaka temple at Bhumli the fish emblem occurs several times side by side with representations of monkeys.[2] The Makara is the conizance of the ninth Jain Tīrthaṅkara Puṣpadanta.[3] Even Buddhism has adopted this symbol.[4] It is worth noting that the form or aureole of Makara and lotus-leaf is still followed by Śaivite image-makers in South India. The fish is the vehicle of Khizr, the water-god, and hence has become a sort of totem of the Śiah Mussalmans.

That the fish was closely associated with the social activities of the ancient Indians can be seen from the fact that the *Mahābhārata* depicts how Arjuna, to win over Draupadī in Svayaṁvara, had to hit his arrow against the target consisting of the eye of the fish.

(f). *The Matsyāvatāra of Viṣṇu*

In one of his writings Father Heras points out that the idea of the Matsyāvatāra of Viṣṇu is a direct borrowing from that of the proto-Indian cult of Śiva. In later mythology, various exploits are attributed to Viṣṇu in this connection, namely, the saving of Manu from the great deluge; the taking out of the Vedas from the clutches of Hayagrīva or some other demon, who had stolen the same away into the depths of the sea; and the bringing of the conch-shell called Pāñcajanya after destroying the demon Pañcajana. The first exploit consists of the saving of Manu or Satyavrata Manu and is said to have taken place either in Northern or Southern India. The second is described to have taken place in Prayāga or some other place. However, before entering into the *pros* and *cons* of the problem of the proto-Indian origin of these flood legends, we shall make a study of the legend of Manu itself first.

Manu and the Flood

The story of Manu is related with some variance in the various literary works i.e. the *Atharvaveda*[5] (where only a slight reference in made), the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*([6]), the *Mahābhārata*,[7] the *Matsya*,[8]

---

1. Moses, *op. cit.*, p 552;
2. Burgess, *Reports* II, p. xliii.
3. Blacker, *The A.B.C. of Indian Art*, p.54. Illustration, p.56.
4. Havell, *Indian Architecture*, p.82.
5. *Atharvaveda*, XIX. 39.
6. *Śatapatha Br.* I, 8.
7. *Mbh. Vanaparva*, Adh. 190.
8. *Matsya*, Adh. 1.

Bhāgavata,[1] *Skānda*,[2] *Viṣṇudharmottara*,[3] *Agni*,[4] *Garuḍa*,[5] *Nāradīya*,[6] *Kālikā*,[7] and *Brahmavaivarta*[8] *Purāṇas* respectively.

The oldest account of the story is narrated in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.* It forms the nucleus of all the later stories. While explaining the value and object of the Idā ceremony the story of the Flood is introduced as follows:

'In the morning they brought water to Manu to wash with, even as they bring it today to wash hands with. While he was washing, a fish came into his hands. The fish said, 'keep me, and I will save thee'. 'What wilt thou save me from?' 'A flood will sweep away all creatures on earth. I will save thee from that'. 'How am I to keep thee?' 'As long as we are small', said the fish, 'we are subject to much destruction; fish eats fish. Thou shalt first keep me in a jar. When I outgrow that, thou shalt take me down to the sea, for there shall I be beyond destruction.'

'It soon became a (great horned fish called a) Jhaṣa, for this grows the largest, and then it said: 'the flood will come this summer. Look out for me, and build a ship. When the flood rises, enter into the ship, and I will save thee.' After he had kept it, he took it down to the sea. And the same summer, as the fish had told him, he looked out for the fish, and built a ship. And when the flood rose he entered into the ship. Then swam up the fish; and thus he sailed swiftly up toward the mountain of the north. 'I have saved thee', said he (the fish). Fasten the ship to a tree. But let not the water leave thee stranded while thou art on the mountain (top). Descend slowly as the water goes down'. So he descended slowly, and that descent of the mountain of the north is called 'the descent of Manu'. The flood then swept off all the creatures of the earth, and Manu here remained alone.' Then it is told how Manu begets the race of Mankind through his daughter Idā.

This account forms the basis of all the later stories. Let us trace the main aspects of the later additions or deductions made in regard to the story itself.

Main issues of the Legend.

The main issues of the legends occurring in Indian literature may be summarised as follows:

Manu

The *Matsya P.* describes that Manu was the son of Vivasvata, and that he renounced his kingdom in favour of his son, and went to the forest of Malaya for practising penance. The *Bhāgavata* states that, 'He, who is by name Satyavrata, is a Rājarṣi and the Lord of Draviḍas (Draviḍeśvara). It is heard that he was Manu the son of Vivasvat. He was one devoted to Nārāyaṇa'. All the other Purāṇas agree in calling 'the hero of the flood' as Manu.

Manu and the Fish

The *Agni* and *Bhāgavata* describe that the small fish jumped into the hands of Manu, when he was offering a libation of water on the banks of the Kṛtamāli, which, as Father Heras points out, is the same River

1. *Bhāgavata*, viii, Adh. 24 ff. ix. Adh. 1 ff.
2. *Skānda*, v, 3, Adh. 2, 34; *Vaiṣṇava Kh., Kārttika Mā* 3,24 ff.
3. *Viṣṇudharmottara P.* Adh. 75.
4. *Agni P.* 2 ff.
5. *Garuḍa, Pūrvabhāga Ācāra-kāṇḍa*, 87, 12.
6. *Nāradīya P.* Adh. 66.
7. *Kālikā P.* Adh. 32.
8. *Brahmavaivarta P.* iv. Adh. 3.

that joins the Vaigai at Madura. The *Mahābhārata* states that the scene took place on the banks of the Chirini.

The various Purāṇas relate how the fish foretold Manu of the forth-coming danger (flood). The *Agni P.* describes it as being snowy. Further, the fish is in every case a horned fish.

The Ship and Fish

The ship in which Manu sailed was tied to the horn of the fish. Some of the versions say that the rope with which the ship was tied consisted of a serpent.[1] The *Viṣṇudharmottara* describes that Satī (Śiva's consort) herself had become the ship[2]. The *Brahmavaivarta* describes that the ship was Amṛtā herself.[3]

Ship and Mountain

Some of the Purāṇas describe the place where the ship was tied down and where Manu descended. Further the *Atharvaveda* states :

'Where is the sinking of the ship the summit of the hill of snow,
There is the embodiment of life that dies not'.[4]

The *Mahābhārata*, while endorsing the same account, relates that the place where Manu descended is situated on the Himālayas, and that it is known as 'Naubandhana' even now.[5] The *Brahmavaivarta P.* clearly states that Manu got down on the summit of the Trikūṭa mountain.

These are the main issues of the story.

The Fish and its Proto-Indian Character.

It has already been observed how the fish played an important role in the socio-religious life of the Mīnas, and how it was closely associated with Śiva in those times. Father Heras observes that the horn-fish (Kombu Mīn) was also identified with Śiva during that period.

In this connection, Father Heras refers to a tradition which is found to be current among the Paravas in later times. 'They used to plant the 'horn' or the 'sword' of the sword-fish in the sand in the midst of their houses; and when they went a—fishing they garlanded it and worshipped with ceremony and pomp the spirit behind it.'[6]

Thus the fact is further corroborated that not only the fish but the horned fish was held in reverence amongst the proto-Indians. And evidently this must have been the idea behind the whole story when they said, that the Fish saved Manu, the first of human beings—the divinity behind the fish being all the while Śiva, the Supreme Being of the proto-Indians.

Location of the Origin.

Thus if the above conclusions be correct, namely, that the worship of the fish-emblem of God Śiva was prevalent in the country of the Mīnas, and that all this

1. Cf. *Agni P.* 2, 13.
2. *Viṣṇudharmottara P. Khaṇḍa*, I 75, 9.
3. *Brahmavaivarta P.*, iv. Adh. 3,30ff.
4. *Atharvaveda*, XIX, 39.
5. *Mbh. Vana Parva*, Adh. 190, 48-49.
6. *Paṭṭu-paṭṭu*, *Pattinapalai*, ls. 81-103.

belonged to the pre-Vedic period, then we should be really in a position to prove that the version of the exploits of the Fish-God also must have arisen in this land alone.

The version of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, which is the earliest in Indian literature, must really help us in solving the above problem. The *Śatapatha* narrates that the fish saved Manu from the flood (*aughaḥ*) and that it took him to the northern mountain (*uttaram girim*).

As has been observed above, both the *Atharvaveda* and the *Mahābhārata* agree in describing that the spot where the bark was tied down is situated in the Himālayan mountain. The *Brahmavaivarta P.* clearly states that Manu got down on the summit of the Trikūṭa mountain. The Trikūṭa mountain is generally described as 'a triple-peaked mountain situated in the outer Himālaya, south of Chanani, held sacred by the Hindus. It is a curious three-peaked hill, the last culminating point of the range separating Chenab from the Rāvī. It is also a mountain in Kashmir.' Further, as Das rightly observes it, there is some indication in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* of the situation of the region named Iḷā. There it has been stated that Manu at the time of the great deluge sailed in his ship northward from the shores of the southern ocean, and his bark having been stranded on the 'Northern mountain', i.e. the Himālaya, he disembarked and landed on firm ground on the mountain. Here he met a beautiful damsel named Iḷā, who described herself as his daughter. It is very probable that this was the region (situated in Kashmir) called Iḷā in the *Ṛgveda* and if our surmise be correct, it was situated on the Himālaya and regarded as one of the best countries'.[1]

The exploit of the fish refers to the oceanic activities. And if we take into consideration the near distance of the spot where Manu is supposed to have landed from the original habitat at of the Mīnas, namely, Harappa and other sites, then it becomes absolutely evident that the legend must have originated first in the land of the Mīnas alone. This shows evidently the proto-Indian character of the fish legend.

Age of the Flood.

The tradition is preserved amongst many other peoples and nations *i. e.* the Bhils[2], the Tāmiḷs, *etc.* The Babylonian legend has acquired a peculiar fame by itself.

The Babylonian account has many similarities with those of the Indian. 'The Fish-God Ea gives a warning of the coming danger to Uta Napishtim, the Babylonian Noah. It also acts as the saviour and announces the doom to Napishtim. It appears after the flood to Napishtim, as the fish does to Manu and reveals its identity.'[3]

Probably on account of all this, some scholars have opined or proposed that the story is of foreign origin, and that it must have travelled from the Babylonian region to India through the trading Phœnicians[4], or even earlier[5]. Max Müller

1. Das, *Rigvedic India*, I, p. 59. 2. *Ibid.*
3. Peake, *The Flood*, p. 25.
4. Kennedy, 'Early Commerce of Babylon with India', *J. R. A S.*, 1898, pp. 260 ff.
5. Regozin, *Vedic India*, p. 345.

maintained that the story is absolutely independent from that of the Babylonian, and that it is of Aryan origin[1]. Vaidyanatha 'seems to suggest' that the Dravidians must have carried away the legend to Babylonia, after having adopted it from the Aryans[2]. Tilak proposes an Indo-Iranian origin to the legend[3].

But we have already seen how the idea of the horned fish and that of a particular divinity attached to it was current amongst the proto-Indians. If this be so then there is every possibility of the legend emigrating from India into the outside world. The account of Berossus is further interesting in this connection. It shows how the culture of the Mīnas had travelled to the land of Sumer from India. Berossus says that the civilisation was first established in Sumer by men who came from the east, and that those were half-men and half-fishes. According to Father Heras these must have been the same as the Mīnas of India, whose deity was closely associated with the fish. This story must give us the right clue in regard to the proto-Indian origin of the legend.

Various Transformations of the Legend.

Once the flood legend assumed currency, it must have assumed different shapes and forms in the hands of the people. Perhaps even a small flood could have given them an opportunity to create a new story. The legends of Viṣṇu, namely, of saving the Vedas from the clutches of Hayagrīva or some other demon,[5] or of the acquiring the Śaṅkha (conch-shell) by killing Pāñcajanya, are of this type. As time went on the legend of the fish underwent three stages of transformation in India. In the first stage the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* deprives it of the proto-Indian character of the Divinity which was originally identified with the fish. In the second, the fish stands identified with Brahmā in the *Mahābhārata*. Finally, in the third stage, the advocates of Vaiṣṇavism attribute all the doings of the fish to their Supreme God Viṣṇu, the preserver of the universe.[6]

(We have already discussed part of this problem in Part I)[7].

III. THE NAGA (Serpent)

Introductory — Proto-Indian Period - Vedic period - Aryanization of the Nāga cult - Main aspects of Serpent cult.

Introductory. The problem of the serpent in Indian Zoolatry is of a very great and fascinating interest. Apart from the mention made of it in early Indian literature, the Greek writers like Nearchos, the Admiral of Alexander, Onesikratos and Ælian, who refers to actual serpent worship, and the Chinese pilgrims

1. Max Muller, *India, What can it teach us?* pp. 133–39.
2. Vaidyanatha Ayyar, 'The Flood Legend of the East', *J. B. H. S.* II, p. 11.
3. Tilak, *The Arctic Home in the Vedas*, p. 385–87.
4. Heras, *MSS.*; cf. also *Berossus and die Babylonische-Hellenistische Literature*, pp. 172–75.
5. *Nāradīya P.*66,46; *Śānti Parva*, 46; *Skānda P. Vaiṣṇava Kh. Karttika Mā.* 13,24,ff; *Garuḍa P. Ācāra-kāṇḍa*, 87,12; *Brahmavaivarta*, iv., Adh. 3.
6. cf. also Heras, *Mss.*
7. cf; *ante*, pp.31ff.

like Fa Hian and Yuan Chwang have referred to the dreadful character of the serpent.[1] Barth rightly pointed out the varied nature of the serpent in the religious lore of the Indians thus: 'the direct adoration of the animal, the most formidable and mysterious of all the enemies of men; (2) a worship of the deities of the waters, springs, and rivers, symbolized by the waving forms of the serpent; (3) conception of the same kind as that of the Vedic Ahi, and connected closely with the great myth of the storm and the struggle of light and darkness.'[2] The serpent-lore has occupied a very vast field in the whole of Indian literature e.g. the Vedas, the *Mahābhārata*, the Purāṇas, the Buddhist *Jātakas* and other allied works. It is also worth noting that we find the existence of a tribe bearing the name of the serpent, namely, the Nāgas. The Nāgas played a very prominent part in the early cultural history of India. The Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis, the Pallavas, the kings of Udayana, the Karkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir, the rulers of Manipūr, the rulers of the Baster State including most of the Gond chiefs, the Kāyasthas of Bengal, Śālivāhana of Pratiṣṭhāna, the Bhāraśivas of Central India, the rulers of the Hindu dynasty of the Khmer kingdom of Cambodia, and individuals like Arjuna and Ulūpi, Kuśa (son of Rāma), and the Nāga princess Kumudvatī, the Brāhman Viśākha and Candralēkhā, the Nāga prince Kīrtisena and a Brāhmaṇī (who were the parents of the famous Guṇāḍhya)—all these instances betray the close association of the ancient people with the Nāga tribe, who were renowned for their excellent beauty and culture. They had spread everywhere in India and the Greater India in ancient times. It has now become almost difficult to study the history of the Nāgas in ancient India mainly because the literature almost always depicts them in their half-human and half-animal form.

Various theories are proposed in regard to either the origin of serpent-worship or the serpent race in India. Fergusson contends that the Nāgas referred to in Indian literature are not the serpents but the worshippers of serpents, and that these came from the stock of an aboriginal race of Turanian stock, which was neither Dravidian nor Aryan in origin[3]. Oldenberg asserts that the Nāgas belong to that class of demoniacal beings which is best represented by the wer-wolves.[4] Hendrik Kern opines that the Nāgas are essentially water-spirits.[5] In the meanwhile, Oldham proposes that, 'the Nāgas were originally not demons, but people who claimed descent from the Sun and had the hooded-serpent for a totem.[6] Elliot Smith suggested a theory of migration, according to which, with megalithic building, terrace culture and many other things, the serpent-worship originated in Egypt about 800 B. C., and was spread thence by the Phœnicians to India, the Far-east, and the Pacific Islands, and eventually reached America.

However, in the light of the evidence of the Mohenjo Daro representations and the inscriptions, it can be definitely stated that the notion of veneration towards

1. Cf. J. W. MCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, Westminister, 1901, pp 51 ff, 34f, 140, 145; cf. also Legge, *Travels of Fa Hian and Hiuen Tsiang*, pp. 29, 52, 67, 68, 96, etc.
2. Barth, *The Religions of India*, pp. 266 f.
3. Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, p.43.
4. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 86.
5. Cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
6. Oldham, *The Sun and the Serpent*, pp. 30f.

the serpent was current amongst the proto-Indians. The Nāga happened to be an emblem of Śiva, and it was also the name of a tribe. It should be noted, however, that the name of the Nāga race is not due to any totemistic idea. But the tribe seems to have been so called because the Nāga happened to be their heraldic device or *Lāñochana*.[1] In fact, Indrajit is actually described to have decorated the figure of a Nāga on his banner.

The reminiscences of the Nāga tribe in India are still to be found on the mountain ranges which form the eastern boundary of Assam. They are now classified under four groups: (1) The *Nāga-bodo* occupying the Kachar Hills and the hills situated to the north-west of Maṇipūr; (2) the Western Nāgas; (3) the Central Nāgas; and finally, (4) the Nāga Kuki (in the area of the Maṇipūr State). The Western and the Central tribes are under British administration.[2]

Now let us trace the history of the Nāga cult during the various periods of the religious history of India.

(a). *The Proto-Indian Period*

The Mohenjo Daro seals have provided us with ample materials in regard to the prevalence of the idea of veneration towards the Nāga in those early times.[3] One of the symbols of Śiva, the proto-Indian God, is the serpent. An inscription reads, 'the snake of the shining worshipful three-eyed one'[4]. This inscription evidently indicates the association of the serpent with Śiva. Again another seal represents that Śiva is seated in the middle and two devotees are shown as seated on his either side. Behind them are depicted the figures of the Nāgas with raised hoods[5]. There are other seals which represent the celestial tree as being protected by the serpents (cf. under *Dendrolatry*).

All these instances clearly prove that the idea of veneration towards the Nāga had attained a peculiar prominence during the proto-Indian period–perhaps only to receive a shocking blow at the hands of the early Aryan immigrants.

(b). *Early attempts of the Aryans against the Nāga Cult*

i. The Indra-Vṛtra Myth

It cannot be gainsaid that the Aryans never believed in the serpent cult before they entered into the precincts of India. At least a close study of their history during the different stages of their migration does not disclose anything otherwise. Therefore, there would be nothing surprising if we find that immediately after their advent, the first step that they took in Aryanizing the Nāga cult was to introduce the Indra–Vṛtra myth. In our opinion, this myth is a pure creation of the Vedic Aryans probably innovated as a denotation of their distastefulness or abhorrence of the custom of serpent veneration as practised by the indigenous peoples of India.

1. Cf. also Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, p. 143; Oldham, *op. cit.*, pp. 30, 184, 206.
2. *E. R. E.* I. p. 123.
3. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions', *J. U. B.* Pt. I. p. 1.
4. Marshall, *M. D.* No. 251.
5. *Photo M. D.* 1929–30, No. 7901.

Added to this, there seems to have been one more instinct amongst these early immigrants when they introduced this myth, and that was evidently the one of racial superiority, and a consequent superiority of their gods also. Indra was their mighty lord, and if he was to destroy the leaders and armies of the heroic peoples of India-the so-called Dāsas, Dasyus and Asuras, he must also do so in the case of their gods also. In fact, he is invoked to destroy the Śiśna-dēvāḥ (which expression according to us means the nude figures of Śiva)[1], Mūra-Dēvāḥ,[2] or even Kṛṣṇa,[3] the God of the Ābhīras. Eventually, Vṛtra, who is also designated as *Deva*[4] in the *Ṛgveda*, was the Nāga *par excellence* of the non-Aryans, and was to meet the same fate of his other co-deities, and that too at the hands of Indra alone.

Vṛtra.

Vṛtra is described as the chief adversary of Indra. Hence in many hymns Indra is designated as Vṛtrahan, the same as Verethraghna in the Avesta. The act of his killing Vṛtra is referred to as *Vṛtra-turya* or *Vṛtrahatyā*. Vṛtra is identified with the Greek Orthos.

The main characteristics of Vṛtra are: 'He is the son of Dānu,[5] which is the name of his mother. He is once designated as Ahi or serpent. He is without feet or hands.[6] The hymns refer to his head,[7] jaws,[8] his hissing and snorting. It is said that *Vṛtra causes thunder, lightning, mist and hail.*[9]

'Vṛtra has a hidden (ninya) abode, whence the waters, when released by Indra, escape overflowing the demon.[10] He lies on the waters,[11] or enveloped by waters at the bottom (budhna) of the *rajas* or aerial space.[12] He is also described as lying on a *sānu* or summit of a mountain,[13] or as having been cast down by Indra from lofty heights.[14] The number of fortresses is said to have been 99.[15] Vrtra was the encloser of the streams.[16] The expression Vṛtras (plural) also occurs once.

'In the Brāhmaṇas Vṛtra is identified with the moon.[17] Once he is designated as a Brāhmin. The story of Indra's exploit over Vṛtra is of free and common occurrence in the Epics and the Purāṇas. However, therein he loses his original serpent-character, and is described as being the son of Tvaṣṭā.[18]

Exploits of Indra.

As Bal Gangadhar Tilak has beautifully summarised the results of the Indra-Vṛtra fight: "there are four simultaneous effects of the war", says he, "the release of

1. Karmarkar, *'Fresh and Further Light on the Mohenjo Daro Riddle'*, *Annals of the B.O.R. Institute*, XXI, pp.122–3.
2. *Rgveda*, VII. 104, 24; X. LXXXII. 2.
3. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 82–83.
4. *Rv.* I. 32, 2.
5. *Rv.* I. 32, 9—cf. also Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, in this connection.
6. *Rv.* I. 32, 7.
7. I. 52, 10; 8, 6, 6.
8. I. 52, 6.
9. I. 3.
10. I. 32, 10.
11. I. 121, 11; 2. 11.99.
12. I. 52, 6.
13. I 80, 5.
14. VI. 3, 19.
15. VII. 19, 5; 8, 82, 2.
16. III. 33, 6.
17. VII. 19, 4.
18. Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 159.

the waters, the release of the cows, the release of the dawn, and the production of the sun"[1]. The Ṛgvedic hymns give rather a graphic description of the fight: 'Heaven and earth tremble with fear when Indra strikes Vṛtra with his bolt.[2] Even Tvaṣṭṛ, who forged the bolt, trembles at Indra's anger.[3] Indra shatters Vṛtra with his bolt on his back;[4] strikes his face with his pointed weapon;[5] and finds his vulnerable parts.[6] Indra smites Vṛtra who encompassed the waters,[7] or the dragon that lay around the waters[8] (or even *on* the waters). Indra is designated as Apsujit. Vṛtra was obstructing the waters[9] for many dawns and autumns, and Indra let loose the waters after slaying Vṛtra[10]. Indra cleaves the mountain, thus making the streams flow or letting the cows free[11]. He set free the pent up springs, the udder of the mountain[12]. He made the seven rivers (Sapta-Sindhavaḥ) flow[13]'.

Various Theories.

The word Vṛtra is generally derived from '*Vr*' to 'encompass'. However, without going into the question of the veracity of the above interpretation, we shall briefly summarise the various theories propounded by scholars in the East and the West. It should be noted at the outset that, "the great majority of Vedic scholars regard the slaying of Vṛtra and the release of waters as referring to the atmospheric drama of the thunder-storm in which the demon of draught is pierced by the lightning and made to surrender the pent up waters, which fall to the earth in the form of rain."[14] Professor Hermann Oldenberg interpreted the myth as 'indicating the freeing of the waters from the prison of the cloud-mountain. But the conception in the Ṛgvedic environment was transferred into the freeing of the earthly waters from the earthly mountains.[15] Hillebrandt observed[16] that 'Vṛtra the encompasser' was originally a personification of cold and ice, a 'winter-giant,' and that Indra was a Sun-God, his original task being to free the waters from the clutches of the ice-demon. He further remarked that, 'the demon who surrounds the rivers, who lies on the streams or mountains, handless and footless, who shuts up, covers, chains, binds the waters, when Indra with his thunderbolt pierces in his sleep, is no phenomenon that is intelligible on Indian soil or has its analogon in the language of the poets.'[17]

Tilak interpreted the myth in a different manner altogether. He says, "But whether the exploits of Vṛtrahan were subsequently ascribed to Indra, as the releaser of captive waters, was afterwards mistaken for the God of Rain, like Tiṣṭrya in the Avesta, one fact stands out boldly amidst all details viz., that captive waters were the aerial waters in the nether world, and that the capacity represented the annual struggle between light aud darkness in the original home of the Aryans in the Arctic region."[18]

---

1. Tilak, *Arctic Home in the Vedas*, p. 255.
2. *Rv*. I. 180, 11; II. 9-10; VI. 17, 9.
3. I. 80, 14. 4. I. 32, 7. 5. I. 52, 15. 6. III. 32, 4; V. 32, 5.
7. VI. 20, 2. 8. IV. 19, 2. 9. II. 11, 5. 10. IV. 19, 8.
11. I. 57, 6. 12. V. 32, 1-2. 13. I. 32, 12.
14. Griffith, *The Religion of the Rigveda*, pp. 180ff. 15. Oldenberg, *Rigveda*, 51, n.7.
16. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, iii, pp. 162ff. 17. Tilak, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

Griffith suggested an interpretation just midway. "At any rate," says he, "it seems clear that Indra like Varuṇa was a regent of both heavenly and earthly waters. Vṛtra may be interpreted, then, as anything which obstructs the waters, or mountain-barriers or snow in the case of the earthly waters."[1]

In our opinion, none of these theories are applicable to the famous myth, especially in view of the fact that none of these scholars have been able to appreciate and evaluate the historical back-ground of the Indra-Vṛtra myth. The gist of the Indra-Vṛtra myth indicates that Vṛtra is a serpent (ahi)[2] *par excellence*. He manipulates lightning, thunder, mist, darkness and hail (*cf. supra*). And Indra is described to have killed such Vṛtra and made the seven rivers flow, and the sun to shine.

Now, as we have remarked above, the creation of this myth seems to have been the first step taken towards Aryanization of the cult of the Nāgas, which was already in vogue in the Mohenjo Daro times. The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and representations have already indicated that the serpent acted as an emblem of Śiva and that it was venerated also. The Aryans, on the other hand, instead of making Indra to subdue these, seem to have thought it wise to represent them as being killed at the hands of Indra. The place of the exact phenomenon that seems to have occurred is probably in the land of Kashmir. We see shall whether the local legends of the Nāgas supply us with any clue regarding this phenomenon.

The *Nīlamata Purāṇa* details two or three legends which are of absorbing interest. It is said that, "at first, after it (Kashmir) had been desecrated, human beings could live there only for six months. The remaining half of the year, it was occupied by the Piśācas or goblins under their ruler Nikumbha. At the beginning of spring when the snow had melted away the Piśāca King with his whole army left the country and went to fight the goblins that live in the ocean of San viz., the great desert of Central Asia. Then the human inhabitants came to live in Kashmir during the summer, but when they had gathered their harvest and the winter approached, the Piśācas returned and no human being could abide owing to the excessive cold. Thus it continued during four Yugas. Then it happened that an old Brahmin, Candradēva by name, stayed behind and found a refuge in the subterranean palace of Nīla, the king of the Nāgas. Not only did he find shelter here against the cold but the Serpent King consented to his wish that in future the people shall be allowed to dwell in the country the whole year round. Moreover, Nīla imparted to his guest the rites which should be observed by the inhabitants of Kashmir. From that time onwards the people were no longer troubled by the Piśācas, and there was no heavy fall of snow as long as they observed the rites."[3]

Again there is another legend which relates that, "the Nāgas were the cause of the heavy fall of snow. Further the account relates that the king was forced to reside in Darvābhisāra during the cold season, as the rites prescribed in the *Nīlamata Purāṇa* were not properly observed."[4] There are also other stories which record that

1. Griffith, *op.cit.*, p. 182.
2. *Rv.* I.32,3.
3. Vogel, *Indian Serpent-lore*, p. 223.
4. Kalhaṇa, *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, ii, 28-31; Stein's *Transl.*, Vol.i, p.5f.

Kashmir was originally a lake, and therefore, it was not habitable. The festivals observed by the people of Kashmir in honour of the Nāgas also throw a flood of light on the problem. There are two festivals[1] which are closely connected with the legend of the Piśācas and their occupation of Kashmir. The full-moon day of Caitra, the first month of spring, is the day on which Nikumbha and his host of goblins were wont to leave the country. On that day it is ordained that people should make a clay image of Nikumbha and pay reverence to it. The night should be passed with music and the next day the people should ascend the hills to pay farewell to Nikumbha. The next festival takes place in the month of Aśvayuj, the first month of autumn. Later, another feast is observed at the first fall of snow. In this the Himālaya, and Hemanta and Śiśira are worshipped. The Nāga also is worshipped as the snow-fall is attributed to his agency alone.[2]

In fact the whole position has been beautifully described by Vogel, who says, "From more than one passage in Kalhaṇa's chronicle it is obvious that in the Happy Valley the Nāgas were eminently deities. The people of Kashmir had indeed good reason to hold them in veneration. For here, too, they were the water-spirits inhabiting lakes and springs, who, when propitiated, granted timely rain for the crops. But when roused to anger, they caused hail-storms, heavy snow-fall, and disastrous floods'.[3]

Location of the Indra-Vṛtra Myth.

Now if we are able to locate the site of the mythical fight also in the Happy Valley, we shall be in a still safer position to corroborate our view-point. Hillebrant, however, had proposed a foreign origin in regard to the location of this particular phenomenon. Tilak held a similar view but in another manner. But we agree with the famous scholar Sten Konow when he strongly opposes this view-point. He says, "under such conditions as prevail in the Punjab, it would not be natural to ascribe the annual increase in the bulk of the rivers to the activity of the rivers rains. The rain-fall is, over a large area, too scanty to account for it; and, moreover, the great rise in the rivers takes place before the proper rains set in. Those who are unaware of the influence exercised by the melting of the snows in the high hills, as the Vedic Aryans probably were in some way hemned in behind the mountains, but released in the period preceding the summer floods. That is just the time of storms and cyclones, that may 'bring fogs that are not blown away, even in the desert' (*dhanvan cid a Rudriyāsaḥ Kṛṇvanti avatam*-*ṚV*. i. 38. 7). In such circumstances, we have no right to consider the God Indra who slays Vṛtra as a pre-Indian God or demon. The ancient popular tales about serpents and their slayers have been adapted so as to suit the popular condition of the Punjab and in thus localising them the name of Indra would naturally present itself to mind. In other words the Vedic story about the slaying of Vṛtra and the deliverance of waters is Indian, and Indra can only have come to play his role in it on the Indan soil'.[4]

1. Vogel, *op. cit.*, pp. 223–24.
2. *Ibid*, p. 124.
3. *Ibid*, p. 230.
4. Sten Konow, *The Aryan Gods of the Mitani People*, pp. 13–14.

Résumé.

Thus the various legends depicted in the *Rājataraṅgiṇi* and the *Nīlamata Purāṇa*, as read along with the problem of the location of the Indra-Vṛtra fight, point out exactly where the working of the Aryans lay. The difficulty in the way of correctly interpreting the version lay mainly in the fact that the earlier notions of the destructive power of the Nāgas and that of due veneration to them were kept absolutely apart when the question of the Indra-Vṛtra myth was at issue, and *vice versa*. In fact the question was being studied without bringing the two issues together, namely, that of the Nāgas as depicted in the local legends of Kashmir (i.e. by causing snow, hail-storm, rain and darkness, for which reason they are propitiated even to the present day); and secondly, that of the Indra-Vrtra myth. Thus the proper solution was never arrived at, mainly on account of the fact that the two issues remained bifurcated up-till-now.

The Nāgas were being propitiated and venerated in Kashmir and other parts of India. And the Aryans, on the other hand, made Indra to kill Vṛtra simply perhaps to make these beliefs free from the abortive elements contained therein. Nay, they even continued in the same strain, and we find in the *Vājasanēyi Saṁhitā* that even Rudra is invoked to destroy Vṛtra.

Konow pointed out that the "other slayers of dragons are the Armenian Vahagn, the Norse Sigurd, who killed the serpent Fa'fnir and acquired the Sigurd who killed the Hydra, St. George who slew the dragon, and so forth." [2] However, neither the existence of these myths, nor the arguments put forth by Hillebrandt and Tilak need at all come in our way of accepting the above conclusion.

ii. The Serpent Sacrifice

The initiation of the serpent sacrifice at the hands of King Janamējaya[3] seems to be the next step taken by the Aryans just to indicate their keen abhorrence against the Nāga cult. As seen above, in the Ṛgvedic period they innovated a mythology according to which their heroic God Indra is made to kill Vṛtra; but, here is an instance which actually professes a sacrifice of the Nāgas.

Oldham proposes that this story has a historical back-ground and that a fight must have taken place between the Nāgas (tribe) and Janamējaya, as a consequence of which the question of the performance of the sacrifice ensues later on.[4] On the other hand, Winternitz pointed out that the story has the character of the magical incantation. He also quoted some parallels from the folklore of the Alps (Tyrol), Denmark, and Pyrenes. Says he, "the recollection of such ancient magical rites, has been preserved in the Sagas in which we find the power of the sorcerers exaggerated to such an extent that the snakes are conceived as hurling themselves into the magical fire."

Now let us pursue the extact story detailed in the *Mahābhārata*, the Purāṇas and other allied literature. "King Parīkṣit, while he had once gone out for hunting,

1. *White Yajurveda*, xvi, 5.
2. Konow, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
3. *Mbh. Ādiparva*, xlix-Lviii.
4. Oldham, *The Sun and the Serpent* (London, 1905), pp. 30 f. and 57 f.

happened to hit his arrow against a deer, which, however escaped alive. Thinking that it was rather a bad omen, he wandered through the forest searching after the deer. In the meanwhile, he met a sage name Śamika and asked him regarding the whereabouts of the deer. The Muni, however, as he was practising a vow of silence, did not reply. The king, being enraged at this, flung a dead serpent, lying nearby, at the neck of the Muni and went away. But when his son Śṛṅgin came there on the scene and saw all that had happened, he uttered a curse saying, "Because that sinful king, despising the twice-born and bringing disgrace upon the race of Kuru, hung a dead snake on the shoulders of my aged father while engaged in austerities, therefore, the Lord of snakes, Takṣaka, that poisonous serpent filled with magic potency, and urged on by the power of my word, will lead him on the seventh day to the abode of Yama, the God of Death." But, when his father came to know of this, he did not like the idea. Still as a precautionary measure, he asked his disciple Gauramukha to relate the whole story to the King. Then the story relates how Takṣaka started, how he met the Dhanvantarī (who had started to save king Parīkṣit from the serpent-bite), how he was sent away after being endowed with a vast treasure, and finally how king Parīkṣit was bitten and killed.

In the meanwhile, just to suit the context, a story is invented to show "how Kadru had cursed her children, and how Manasā, the sister of the serpent-king Vāsuki, had been given in marriage to the hermit Jaratkāru, so that the son born from their union might save the Nāgas from dire destruction." On the other hand, Janamējaya, in consequence of having a direct vengeance against Takṣaka and his brethren, started a snake-sacrifice, mainly at the instigation of Uttaṅka. The story then narrates how Āstika, son of Jaratkāru, later interfered, and how Takṣaka and the surviving serpents were saved'.

Whatever may be the other implications of this myth, we feel certain that the story, as it is, shows one of the greatest innovations of the Brāhman writers. As noted above, they had invoked Indra and Rudra to destroy Vṛtra and the serpents respectively, and here they have devised a plan for systematizing this old idea. Evidently, the Nāgas, which have been all along venerated and propitiated for saving humanity from dire destruction and for causing prosperity, were to be sacrificed at the hands of the sacerdotal order. With the exception perhaps of a single instance of its kind in the year 1193 A.D.,[2] we do not hear of any snake sacrifice taking place in the whole of Indian history. Thus if this view is held as agreeable, we do not see any reason even to doubt the correctness of it especially in view of the fact that the Aryans have shown a tendency towards a brisk Aryanization of the indigenous cults prevailing in India. The theory propounded by Oldham does give us a new perspective especially in regard to the existence of the tribe of the Nāgas at the advent of the Aryans in India. The theory of Winternitz deals with one of the properties of the Nāgas, but both the theories are incapable of throwing any light on the main issue, especially when it is read along with the working of the sacerdotal order.

1. Cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
2. In A. D. 1193 such a sacrifice is said to have been performed in the presence of God Harihara on the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā. Cf. *Epigraphia Carnatica* VIII, Sb. 183,

iii. Aryanization of the Nāga cult.

Some of the Mohenjo Daro seals represent the Nāga as guarding the celestial tree. It is not impossible that early notions like this must have later given rise to the idea of the Nāgas becoming the guardians of the universe also.

As Guardians of the world

The Aryans though in the beginning showed a marked hatred against the Nāga cult, yet after due assimilation they did begin to venerate the serpent as well, and during the period of the *Atharvavēda*, we find clear instances like, "Homage be to Asita, homage to Tiraściraji, homage to Svajā (and) Babhru, homage to the god-people (*deva-jana*)".

But, much more so, a direct effort was made to assimilate the notion of the serpents as being the guardians of the universe. To quote the portion of the hymn itself :[2]

(1) Eastern Quarter: Agni the Regent (adhipati); Asita the warden; the Ādityas the arrows; homage to the regents, homage to the warden, homage to the arrows, etc.

(2) Southern Quarter: Indra the Regent; Tiraścirajī the warden; the Pitaras the arrows; etc.

(3) Western Quarter: Varuṇa the Regent; Pridāku the warden; nourishment the arrows; etc.

(4) Northern Quarter: Soma the Regent, Svajā the warden; the thunderbolt the arrows; etc.

(5) Fixed Quarter: Viṣṇu the Regent, Kalmāṣagrīva the warden; the herbs the arrows; etc.

(6) Upward Quarter: Bṛhaspati the Regent, Śvitra the warden; rain the arrows; etc.

Rightly does Vogel point out that the later idea of Din-Nāga and Lokapāla must have arisen from this above notion.

The *Black Yajurveda* also accepts the tradition though with a slight change[4]. The two Buddhist texts e.g. the *Lalitavistara* and the *Mahāvastu* also partly corroborate the above statement[5]—the *Lokapālas* according to Buddhist tradition being 'Dhṛtarāṣtra, Virūḍhaka, Virūpākṣa and Kubera.'

The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* has partly maintained the tradition. It narrates that the East is the region of Ananta, the North-East that of Vāsuki, the South that of

1. *Atharvaveda* vi, 56-Whitney's *Transl.* vol. viii (*Harvard-Oriental Series*).
2. *Ibid*, iii. 27.
3. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
4. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, Transl. in Winternitz, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
5. *Lalitavistara*, (Ed. Lefmann), pp. 389–91; Transl. Faucaux, pp. 332–5; *Mahāvastu* III, pp. 305–10.

Takṣaka, the South-east that of Karkōṭa, the West that of Padmanābha, the South-west that of Mahāpadma, the North that of Śaṅkhapāla, and the North-west that of Kambala.[1]

Other modes

The Nāga henceforth assumes a prominent position not only in the Aryan pantheon, but in almost all the other religious systems in India. However, we shall deal with the latter problem later on.

(1) *Nāgas and Prajāpati*: We have observed above that the Nāgas had become as if a *part* and *parcel* of Aryanism. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* describes the three kinds of snakes created by Prajāpati.[2]

(2) *Story of Kaśyapa*: Prajāpati soon loses his original position, and Brahman and the nine Brahmāṇas occupy his position. Kaśyapa is said to be the progenitor of mankind. According to the Purāṇic accounts, 'the race of Nāgas is said to be one thousand in number, and is said to have sprung from Kadru, the wife of Kaśyapa, for the purpose of peopling Pātāla or the nethermost region (seventh), where the Nāgas reign in great splendour. From the name of their mother they are designated as Kādraveyas. The other name of their mother is Surasā. Then the story is related how Kadru and Vinatā happened to be the co-wives, how a quarrel took place between them, and how later on a direct enmity existed between Garuḍa, the brother of Aruṇa, and the Nāgas.[3] The story is of common occurrence in the Purāṇas, and has become a theme of common depiction in Indian art.

Thus once the Nāga was brought under the Aryan pantheon, the names of all the Nāgas were Aryanized. Their number is enumerated in many of the Purāṇas, Epics and Buddhist works. The *Mahābhārata* deals with a list of seventy-eight names[4] and later sixty-eight.[5] The *Harivaṁśa*[6] gives two lists of 26 and 18 respectively. The *Bhāgavata*,[7] *Vāyu*,[8] *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Nīlamata* (which gives a number of 500 names) have supplied us with different lists. Finally, the *Saddharma P.* and the *Mahāvyutpatti* give a list of 80 Nāgarājas. The main Nāgarājas are Śeṣa, Vāsuki, Takṣaka, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Airāvata (Elāpatra), Karkoṭa (ka), Śaṅkha and others.

(3) *Nāga-worship*: Besides the homage paid to them in the *Atharvaveda* and the Brāhmaṇas, the *Gṛhyasūtras* give the Nāgas a prominent place by enjoining acts of offerings to snakes of the earth, air and heaven. It is also ordained that they are to be satiated along with Gods, plants, demons etc.,[9] and that blood is to be poured out to them.[10]

Hopkins aptly summarizes the position: 'the snakes belong to Varuṇa and his regions.[11] It is on the head of the earth-upholding snake Śeṣa that Viṣṇu muses.[12]

1. *Bhaviṣya P.* I. 36.
2. *Śatapatha Brā.*, ii, 5, 1.1.2.
3. Cf. *Mahābhārata, Adi P.* Adi. 15 ff.; *Skānda P.* 5, 3, 72; *Devī-Bhāgavata*, ii, 12, etc.
4. *Mahābhārata, Adi P.*, xxxv, 5–16.
5. *Udyoga P.*, ciii, 9–16.
6. *Harivaṁśa*, 227–30, and 9, 501–04.
7. *Bhāgavata P.* V. xxiv. 29–31.
8. *Vāyu P.*, ii. viii, 66–71.
9. *Śāṅkhā.* Gs.4.9.3.;15.4; *Āśv.* 21.9;3.4,1; *Pāraskara.* 2,14,9.
10. *Āśva.* 4.8·27.
11. *Mahābhārata*, V.98.
12. *Ibid.*, iii.203,12.

The reverence paid to serpents begins to be ritual in the *Atharvaveda*. Even in the *Ṛgveda* there is the deification of the cloud-snake. In later times they answered to the Nymphs, being tutelary guardians of streams and rivers. In i,36 Śeṣa Ananta supports earth, and it is told why he does so.'[1]

(4) *Nāgas and The Caste-system*: The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* even dubs the Nāgas with a caste-system of their own.[2]

(5) *Churning of the ocean*: Later the Purāṇic stories mention that while the Devas and Asuras were churning the ocean *Vāsuki* was made the rope.

(c). *Main Features of Serpent-lore*

The main features of the Serpent-lore may be summarised as follows:

1. *Their residence*: The general dwelling places of the Nāgas are described as being the lakes, springs, rivers and the ocean (which is called as *Nāgānām ālayam*). They are also believed to reside in the ant-hills, guarding the treasure-trove supposed to be under them. On account of this close association the ant-hills also are venerated. In the *Mahābhārata* it is described that Rēṇukā is instructed by the elephants of the four quarters to deposit the Bali (offering) after sunset on an ant-hill.[3] The Nāgas are believed to reside in Pātāla with Bhogavatī as its capital. Some of the mountains are described as their places of residence i.e. Mount Niṣāda, Mt. Dardara, Dhanada (of Nāga Nīla), etc.

2. *Snake as a harbinger*: Apart from the dreadful properties contained in the snake, it being the most dangerous and deadliest of animals, it is directly associated with fertility. The Komaṭi women in Mysore and generally in all the parts in Western and Southern India, worship the cobra for begetting children. The Nāga hero of the Campēya Jātaka was worshipped for the like cause.[4] Hindu and Jain women make vows to install a snake-stone (Nāga-Pratiṣṭhā) provided they are blessed with offspring.

The snake is worshipped at the time of marriages especially by the Beḍars of the Deccan, Brahmins in Kanara, and the Lambadis in Madras.[5] It is worth noting that the Earth-fertility Goddesses Ellammā and Mātaṅgī are accompanied by snake symbols.[6]

3. *Snake as the deceased ancestor*: The serpent is supposed to represent the soul of the deceased ancestor; and it is regarded as Chthonic.

4. *Serpent as Tutelary Deity*: The snake is supposed to be the tutelary deity (*vāstu-sarpa*) of the house.[7] If the snake abandons the house, it is believed that "the perpetuity of the house, the continuity of the race or family," are in danger. Sacrifices are offered to it daily.

---

1. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p.376.
2. *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* 1,36,33 ff. e.g. पुष्पगंधा: स्मृता विप्रा: क्षत्रियाश्चन्दनगंधिन: ।
   वैश्याश्च घृतगंधा वै शूद्रास्सुर्गंधगंधिन: ॥ ३३ ॥ etc.
3. *Mahābhārata-Anuśāsana* P., cxxxii, 7-66.
4. *E. R. E.* XI, P. 416; Thurston, *Omens*, p. 136.
5. *E. R. E.*, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.* Thurston, *Caste and Tribes*, iv. 306, 300.
6. *E. R. E.*, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*
7. *J. A. S. B.* xxxix (1870), p. 206; Crooke, *op. cit.*, vol. vi. p. 144.

5. *Snake as son of Earth.* As in Egypt, the serpent is considered as the son of Earth in India. The mother of serpents is called *Surasā.*

The *Rāmāyaṇa* narrates a story, which brings ont the close connection between the Earth and the Nāgas. It is the pathetic tale of the last Canto, which relates "how Sītā, after having been reunited with Rāma and cleansed from all guilt, is swallowed by the Earth. After Sītā's solemn oath the earth-goddess appears seated on an unrivalled throne which is carried on their heads by Nāgas of boundless might and adorned with jewels. She receives Sītā in both her arms, installs her on the seat and thus returns with her to the nether-world (Rasātala)."[1]

It is also worth noting that Vāsuki's sister Manasā, the wife of Jaratkāru, a sage, is called the Queen of snakes, and is worshipped to obtain preservation from their bites. She sits on the water-lily and is clothed with snakes.[2]

6. *Serpent : Guarding the treasure-trove* :—As in the fairy tales of Greece and Germany, the serpents in India are regarded as guarding the buried treasures.[3] We have already described their close association with the ant-hills. Besides, they are also believed to possess priceless objects, which are also sometimes provided with magic virtue-and which occasionally they bestow on their friends and favourites.[4]

7. *As Guardians of holy objects* : They also do the work of guarding holy objects as the Buddhist literature would make us believe.

8. *Other minor things* : The serpents are believed to possess spells. They are supposed to be in the habit of thieving away precious things. The hooded serpent is supposed to possess a priceless jewel in its hood. Even Varāhamihira says that, "the snakes of the lineage of Takṣaka and Vāsuki, and the snakes roaming at will (kāmaga), have bright, blue-tinged pearls in their hoods."[5]

9. *Nāga and Svastika* : The curious spectacle marks (called as '*brilslang*' in Dutch and '*serpent a lunettes*' in French) are always referred to in Hindu literature. A legend is current that the hoods of Kāliya bear this mark on account of which the serpent need not be afraid of its enemy Garuḍa. In Buddhist literature Buddha is said to have bestowed this sign upon those Nāgas who offered him shelter e.g. Nāga Muchilinda.

The Nāgas are generally believed to possess a Svastika mark.[6] The *Harivaṁśa*, however, refers to the half-svastika (Svastikārdha).[7] As Vogel has rightly pointed out, this spectacular-mark may well be described as a *Svastikārdha*. He says further, "It is well-known that the Svastika is looked upon as a sign of good

1. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p.20. 2. For the worship of Manasā, cf. Ward, *The Hindu Mythology*, 3. E, Küstar, *Die Schlange in der Griechischen Künst and Religion* p. 120; Vogel, *op. cit.*, p.120. Cf. the *Pañcatantra*; and also, Foucher, *Art Greco-Bouddique* Vol.1,pp.453ff. 4. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p.21.
5. Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, lxxxi, 252.
6. *Harivaṁśa*, P. 2, 26, 43.
7. *Harivaṁśa* (B), 39334, 44100, 5185; *Viṣṇu P. Transl.* by Wilson, p.146.

augury. Quite possible it may have contributed to the sanctity of the animal which was supposed to bear it."[1]

10. *Tree and Serpent worship*: We have already referred to above, that the scene of the serpent guarding the Tree of Life is depicted even on the Mohenjo Daro seals, and that this notion had also travelled in the Middle-Eastern and the Western world.

"In Buddhist times, tree-deities were called Nāgas, and were able at will, like the Nāgas, to assume the human form; and in one story the spirit of a Bunyan tree who reduced the merchants to ashes is called a Nāga-rāja, the soldiers he sends forth from his tree are Nāgas, and the tree itself is "the dwelling place of the Nāga."[2] Again the Nāgas are shown as worshipping the trees both in the reliefs of Bharhut, and Sanchi Stūpas.

The Nāgakals in Mysore are erected under trees facing the rising sun. One of the trees is necessarily a sacred fig representing a female, and another a margosa representing a male; and these are married with the same ceremonies as those of human beings. The Bilpatre (vilva-bilva-patra-*Ægle Marmelos*), sacred to Śiva, is often placed with them.[3]

(d). *Serpent in Indian Systems*

Saivism

We have already seen that the snake was one of the emblems of Śiva. It guarded the celestial tree. The close inimical association of the Garuda and the Snake is also to be seen from one of these earlier representations. In later mythology, Śiva has a girdle of serpents, ear-rings of serpents, a sacrificial cord of serpents, and an outer garment of serpent's skin.[4] Virūpākṣa, a form of Śiva, was the tutelary deity of the city of Vijayanagar. He is also the guardian of the West according to Buddhist mythology. A brazen serpent surrounds the image at the Rajput shrine of Eklingaji.[5] In the Himālaya Bhairava is represented by a coloured stick in the form of a hooded snake, and Śiva as Ṛṣīśvara, surrounded by serpents and crowned with a chalet of hooded snakes.[6] The hooded snake is represented along with Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Sūrya, and Śakti at Ter.[7] Images of Kālī and Bhadrakālī also are keenly associated with snakes. Gaṇeśa also acquired a serpent girdle (cf. the story under *Gaṇapati*). The peacock, which was Kārttikeya's mount (vāhana) carries a snake in its mouth. Vāsuki was used as a rope in the act of churning of the ocean.

Vaisnavism

The famous fight between Nāga Kāliya and Kṛṣṇa has been a motif of representation in many places. Baladēva is supposed to be an *avatāra* of the snake. In the Kṛṣṇa temple at Paṇḍharpūr Rādhā holds snakes in her hands.[8] During the intervals of creation Viṣṇu reposes himself on

1. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
2. *E. R. E.* xi, p. 417.
3. *E. R. E.* xi, p. 417; Rice, *Mysore Gazetteer*, i. 455.
4. Muir, *O. S. T.*, iv, p. 191.
5. *E. R. E.* xi, *loc. cit.*, Tod, Pop.Ed., i. 427.
6. *E. R. E.*, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*
7. *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, 1902–03, pp. 201, 241.
8. Oppert, *On the Original Inhabitants of India*, London, 1893, p.138.

Ananta or Śesa. The Śesa supports the earth. With the help of the serpent Manu moored his ship to the horn of the fish.

Jainism

Jainism has assimilated the serpent-cult into its own faith. The symbol of the 23rd Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha is a serpent.[1] In the case of Supārśvanātha the snake has seven hoods.

Buddhism

Gautama Buddha in Ceylonese sculpture of the 18th and 19th centuries is seated in *Dhyāna-Mudrā* upon the coils of the seven-headed Nāga Muchilinda and sheltered by his expanded hood. On the eastern gateway of Sānchi is represented the scene of Buddha subduing the venomous dragon in the fire hut of the Kāśyapa brothers of *Uruvilva*.[2] The Bodhisattva has a five-fold snake-hood. Buddha has given the Prajñāpāramitā (the book of Transcendental Wisdom) to the Nāgas, for guarding it till the world was ready to grasp it. Nāgārjuna, however, claims to have received it from them, and founded on it the Mahāyāna school. The Nāgataru (Nāga-tree) is an eight-branched coral.[3] The Chinese pilgrims record that the Buddhist Śramaṇas worshipped the Nāga, and conducted rites in Nāga shrines.[4] A favourite gift at modern Buddhist pagodas in Burma is a representation in gold of the Lord Buddha, with a hooded snake raising itself over him.[5]

IV. THE COW

Introductory-Ābhīras in early Literature—The cult of the Cow—The problem of the immolation of the Cow and Bull.

The idea of the early veneration and later on that of the worship of the cow seems to be of an indigenous nature in India. There were also a people bearing the name of the 'cow', namely, the Ābhīras in ancient times. Scholars like Smith,[6] Rapson,[7] D. R. Bhandarkar[8] and some others have maintained that the Ābhīras, like the Gardabhilas, Śakas, Yavanas, Bālhikas, etc. are of foreign origin. V. Kanakasabhai, on the other hand, maintained that the Ābhīras are of an indigenous origin.[9] Father Heras likewise held that the expression Ābhīra must have been derived from the Tāmil expression '*Āyir*' (from *ā*, cow) meaning 'cowherd.' Dr. Bhandarkar further pointed out that the Ābhīras are the same as Āhirs of the present day, and that they are spread as far east as Bengal and as far south as the Deccan.

1. J. G. Bühler, *On the Indian Sect of the Jainas*, Eng. Transl. Lond. 1903, p.71; Oldham, *op.cit.*, p.177. 2. Vogel, *op cit.*, p.38; Fergusson *op.cit.*, p.143, pl.xxxii; Grünwedel, *op.cit.*, p. 62, fig. 35; Foucher, *op. cit.*, pp 57ff, Fig. 5; V.A. Smith, *Hist. of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, fig.47.
3. Getty, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
4. Beal, *op. cit.*, Intro. xli.
5. *E. R. E.* Vol. xi, under *Serpent* (India); also J. G. Scott, *The Burman; his life and notions*, London, 1882, i. 189.
6. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 290.
7. Rapson, *Cat. of Indian Coins in the British Museum*, Intro. p. 45.
8. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 62.
9. V. Kanakasabhai, *Tamil India 1800 Years Ago*, p. 57.

Abhiras in Early Literature

The great geographer Ptolemy refers to the province of Abiria.[1] The *Mahābhārata* mentions the Samśaptaka Gaṇas (or the seven Republics), which include the Śūdr-ābhīras–who were located on the banks of the River Sarasvatī.[2] It styles them as Vṛṣalas.[3] The *Rāmāyaṇa* refers to them along with Surāṣṭra, Vālhika and Bhadra;[4] and with Maru, Anumaru and Surā.[5] Patañjali while commenting on Pāṇini says that the compound 'Śūdrābhīra' cannot be justified as no Dvandva compound can be formed between a Viśeṣa and Sāmānya. But later on, he says that such a compound is possible as the Ābhīras form a separate class (*Mahābhāṣya i. 2,3 on Pāṇ., I, 2.73*). Manu calls the Ābhīra as an offspring of a Brāhmaṇa and a female of the Ambaṣṭha tribe.[6] The beauty of Ābhīra women is always described. Hēmacandra in his *Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi* says that the Ābhīras were a sub-division of theVaiśyas. The famous poet Daṇḍin refers to their language as *Apabhraṁśa.*[7] The Āhirs have influenced the language of the Khāndēsh District, and the language they speak is called Ahirāṇi.[8] They have their own Gujrati dialect in Gujrat and Cutch.[9] They have now different callings: Goldsmiths (Sonars), etc. There are also Ābhīra Brāhmins dwelling in Khāndesh, Gujrat, and Rajputana.[10]

(a). *Their Original Home*

We have already pointed out that the general notion of scholars, with the exception of a few, was that the Ābhīras were of foreign origin. But the various traditions recorded in the Purāṇas and other allied literature prove that they formed one of the proto-Indian tribes.

The word Ābhīra is now current in the form of Āhir or Āher (Gavaḷis). As Kanakasabhai would propose it, the word suggests itself as being of a Dravidian origin. In fact it seems to have been derived from the Dravidian word Āyir (cowherd–from the root Ā, meaning a cow). That the tribe of 'Cows' or 'Cowherds' existed in ancient India becomes clear from the fact that the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* refers to Vaśāḥ, which word has been wrongly interpreted as being eqivalent to Vatsa or Vaṁsa. The word Vaśāḥ in early Vedic literature meant generally a 'cow' though it acquired the sense of 'barren' in later literature. We propose to adduce here some of the grounds on which we have based our conclusion:

(1) That the Ābhīras were the same as the Gopas or Ballavas of Mathurā becomes evident from the fact that the *Padma Purāṇa* while relating the story of the eighth birth of Viṣṇu, mentions that Viṣṇu informed the Ābhīras: 'I shall be born amongst you, O Ābhīras, at Mathurā, in my eighth

1. Ptolemy, *Geo. Cab.*, vii. p. 102 (Ed. Bert.).
2. *Mahābhārata*, II. 35, 16; II. 35. 107.
3. *Ibid*, xiv. 30. 16.
4. *Rāmāyaṇa*, iv. 43,5.
5. *Manu*, x,15.
6. *Ibid*, iv. 43,19.
7. *Kāvyādarśa*, i, 36; their language known as Ābhīri, *Sāhitya-Darpaṇa, Pariccheda*, vi. 6,163.
8. *Bomb. Gaz.*, vol. xii, pp. 42 ff.
9. *Ibid*, Vol. v, pp.78–79.
10. Wilson, *Indian Castes*, Vol. ii, pp.26, 120 and 177.

birth.'[1] The same Purāṇa mentions that the Ābhīras were great philosophers.[2]

(2) That the origin of Kṛṣṇa, the cowherd King of Mathurā, was non-Aryan becomes evident if we accept the most shrewdly logical argument put forth by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar.[3] According to him the word Kṛṣṇa referred to in the expression *Kṛṣṇa drapsaḥ* in the *Ṛgveda*[4] denotes the very same Kṛṣṇa mentioned in later literature. The *Ṛgveda* refers to the fight between Indra and Kṛṣṇa thus: Kṛṣṇa is said to have arrived with his army at the Aṁśumati or Jumna and encamped himself there. There–upon Indra addressed himself to the Maruts : "I have seen Kṛṣṇa swiftly moving on the uneven banks of Aṁśumati like a cloud touching the water. Heroes I send ye forth, go and fight (the) godless legion."

(3) That Kṛṣṇa was a hater of Brāhmanic faith becomes evident from a passage in the *Harivaṁśa*. Therein Kṛṣṇa is described to have said, "Brāhmans perform Yajñas of Hymns, peasants Yajñas of plow-share. We are for the Yajña of the mountain. Let the forest mountain be worshipped by us. Let the cows be worshipped by us. Let the Gods worship Indra, but let us worship the mountain. I will surely cause the worship of the cows through force (if need be)." [5]

(4) That the *Harivaṁśa* states that Kṛṣṇa belonged to the race of Yadu, the son of Haryaśva and Madhumatī, daughter of Madhurākṣasa who ruled over Mathurā. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the *Harivaṁśa* mentions that the whole of the surrounding territory was occupied by the Ābhīras.[6]

(5) That the *Mahābhārata* describes that the Ābhīras formed one of the seven republics (saṁśaptaka Gaṇa), and that they were the friends of the Matsyas, who were a pre-Vedic tribe.

Once the supposition is held as correct, namely, that the Ābhīras were of an indigenous origin and that they were not Aryans, then the whole problem becomes easy of solution : how the story of Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa and the consequent veneration towards the cow must have arisen amongst them originally.

During the historical period, the Ābhīras ruled over vaster territories in Mahārāṣṭra e.g. to the south of the Vindhya Mountains, in the adjoinning territories roundabout Mathurā, and in the region situated to the north of the territories of the Kadambas of Goa.[7]

---

1. *Padma P. 5, Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, 17. 19.
2. *Ibid.*, 17. 1.
3. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 82.
4. *Ṛgveda*, viii. 85. 13–15.
5. *Harivaṁśa*. 1, 16, 41 ff.
6. *Ibid*, 5161–5163.
7. M. H. Krisna, *Excavations at Chandravalli*, p.3.

(b). *The Cult of the Cow*

The cult of the cow was prevalent in Egypt, Greece, in early Summer, Japan, Persia and other countries. In Egypt Isis was worshipped in the shape of a cow. In many mythologies the cow was worshipped as the representative of the earth, or the female principle in nature. Astarte wore the horns of a cow; and Venus suckled a calf. In ancient Scandinavia, the cow was symbolical of the amorphous cosmogonic earth; and in Japan the Sun was represented seated upon a cow (the earth).[1]

In India too, the cow seems to have been venerated since the time of the proto-Indian period. H. Jacobi pointed out that the belief in the sanctity of the cow, which is a very prominent feature of Hinduism, seems to have been inherited by the Indians from pre-historic times, before they and the Iranians had separated.[2] Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar asserts that the idea of the veneration of the cow must have migrated to India from the Iranian region. However, from what we have pointed out in connection with the antiquity of the Ābhīras, and also in regard to the immolation of the cow and the bull (cf. *infra*), we can certainly say that the cow must have been venerated since very ancient times in India—the Ṛgvedic culture coming later on.

The cow is the most sacred animal among the Hindus. The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*[3] and other works describe that all the holy places (tīrthas), and all the Gods are pervaded in the various parts of the cow. Even the hair on its body is inviolable. The Pañcagavya or the five products of the cow—milk, curds, butter, urine and dung —are efficacious as scarcer of demons, are used as remedies in disease, and play a very important part in domestic Gaurocana, a bright yellow pigment prepared from the urine or pigment prepared from the urine or bile of a cow, or as it is said by some, vomitted by her or found in her head, is used for the making of the sectarial mark, or as a sedative, tonic and anthelmintic.[4]

The *Atharvaveda* and later literature generally speak of the adoration of the cow and Brāhmans (cf. under *immolation*). The famous Amṛtamanthana story relates how the Kāmadhēnu formed one of the fourteen jewels found in the ocean. The *Bhavisya Purāṇa* relates that the five Lokas or worlds were, respectively, Nandā, Subhadrā, Surabhi, Suśilā, and Bahulā.[5] They are said to yield everything. The *Mahābhārata* describes that the cows, Brāhmins and the Aśvattha (tree) are immortal. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* describes that the cows are daughters of the heavenly Surabhi (the fragrant one), who was created by Prajāpati from his breath.[6]

(c). *Cow-Worship*

The *Atharvaveda* already describes the cow as being the highest being.[7] But it is only since the time of the Epics and the Purāṇas that the cow attains a considerable prominence. The Epics and the Purāṇas mention the Goloka, the cow-heaven. It is described as a kind of paradise, a most beautiful place of the greatest splendour and happiness, which can be attained only by the most pious and virtuous, especially by

1. Scott, *Phallic Worship*, p.156.
2. H. Jacobi, *Cow*, *E.R.E.* iv. pp.224-25.
3. *Bhaviṣya P.*, 4,69.16.
4. Crooke, *op.cit.*, ii,p.228.
5. *Bhaviṣya P.*,469,16.
6. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* vii, 5.2,6.
7. *Atharvaveda*, xi.5.

givers of cows and by their worshippers.[1] Surabhi is said to reside in Goloka and her daughters (the cows) among mankind.[2] Another account locates her in Rasātala and to have for daughters the Dikpālas, or goddesses presiding over the heavenly quarters[3]. The *Mahābhārata* recommends the worship of the cow and enjoins the recital of mantras.[4] The devotees had to recite the names of the cows, and to bow their heads in reverence to them;[5] and they were enjoined to subsist on the five products of the cow.

The Purāṇas also relate how kings like Satyavāna and others worshipped the cow. Some of the Purāṇas narrate that the cow was cursed by Rudra to eat filthy (Viṣṭhā) substance, and that still they are worshipful.[6]

The Purāṇas enjoin that the cow be worshipped on the 7th (bright-half), 12th (dark-half) days of Aśvayuj or Āśvina, or the 12th day (bright half) of Kārttika (*Bhaviṣya*, 4.69,35 ff).

The worship of the cow is performed by the Jats, Gurjars, Dekkanis and almost all the Hindus in general. The important festivals in connection with the cow are Gokul-Aṣṭami, Gai Yātrā, a Newari festival in Nēpāl, and the Maun Charaun (silent tending of cattle) at the time of Diwāli in North India. The cow-shed itself becomes a temple amongst many families.

Gift of a Cow

The Epics and the Purāṇas also describe the general importance and significance of the offering of a cow or cows (one, eleven, hundred, etc).[7] The *Mānava Gṛhyasūtra* deals with the performance of the Ṣaṣṭhi-kalpa, which is almost a Vrata. Ṣaṣṭhi is called Śrī, Lakṣmī, Kāmapatnī, Dēvī, etc. It is performed for the attainment of progeny and wealth. The priestly fee is only a cow and a bull. Bulls also are to be gifted away along with the cows.

Dr. Hazra has pointed out that in the pre-Yājñavalkya period only the gift of a cow, land, etc. is recommended. But the Purāṇas speak of the gifts of artificial cows made of paddy, raw-sugar, (guḍa), etc.[8] The *Matsya P.* describes the *Guḍa-dhenudāna*.[9]

(d). *Some Other Legends*

Hiranyagarbha rite

When the horoscope forebodes some crime or special calamity, the child is clothed in scarlet, a colour which repels evil influences, and tied on the back of a new sieve, which is a powerful fetish. This is passed through the hind-legs of a cow, forward through the forelegs towards the mouth, and again in the reverse direction, signifying the new birth from the sacred animal. The usual worship and aspersion takes place, and the father smells his child, as the cow smells her calf. The Mahārājā of Travancore was passed in this way through a cow of gold.[10]

---

1. *E.R.E.*, iv.p.226 2. *Mahābhārata (B)*, iii,102. 3. *E.R.E. op.cit.*, p.226.
4. *Mahābhārata* (B), xiii,80,1–3,78,24f. 5. *Ibid*,78.16.
6. *Skānda, Aruṇācala Māhātmya*, 21,3,41.
7. Cf. *Mahābhārata, Āśvamedhika P*, Adh. 102,105 and 106. *Viṣṇudharmottara P*, 2, Adh,43;3rd Adh, 29-30; *Bṛhaddharma P. Uttarakhaṇda*. Adh.26, etc.
8. Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*,p,247.
9. *Matsya P* (B). 82,3–10 (a). 10. Crooke, *op. cit.*, ii. p.231.

The Purāṇas relate the marriage of Brahmā with Gāyatrī at the Puṣkara lake.

Brahma and Gayatri

It is said that once Brahmā proposed to do worship there, but was perplexed where he should perform the sacrifice, as he had no temple on earth like the other gods. So he collected all the other gods, but the sacrifice could not proceed as Sāvitrī alone was absent; and she refused to come without Lakṣmī, Pārvatī, and Indrāṇī. On hearing of her refusal, Brahmā was wrath, and said to Indra: "Search me out a girl that I may marry her and commence the sacrifice, for the jar of ambrosia weighs heavy on my head." Accordingly Indra went and found none but an Ābhīra's daughter from Rasātala whom he purified, and passing her through the body of a cow, brought her to Brahmā, telling him what he had done. Viṣṇu said, "Brāhmans and cows are really identical; you have taken her from the womb of a cow, and this may be considered a second birth." Śiva said, "as she has passed through a cow, she shall be called Gāyatrī." The Brāhmins agreed that the sacrifice might now proceed; and Brahmā having married Gāyatrī, and having enjoined silence upon her, placed on her head the jar of ambrosia and the sacrifice was performed.[1]

Cow and Earth

The cow is sometimes closely associated with the earth. It is generally described that King Pṛthu milked the earth like a cow. It is also worth noting that when Paraśurāma killed the Kṣatriyas thrice three-seven times, the earth went to the sage Kāśyapa for help. Further, the mythical identification of the earth with a cow furnishes the basis of many poetical conceits, e.g. that a king should milk the Earth tenderly to get plentiful revenue, etc.[2]

Crooke gives some interesting features regarding the facts associated with the reverence towards cows. When a disputed boundary is under settlement, a cow-skin is placed over the head and shoulders of the arbitrator, who is thus imbued with the divine influence, and gives a just decision.[3]

Cow's tail

The pious Hindu touches the cow's tail at the moment of dissolution, and by her aid he is carried across the dread river of death. Before being hanged, if allowed to grasp a cow's tail, a criminal ascends the scaffold with greatest composure. The tail of a cow is also used in the marriage ritual, and the tail of the wild cow, though now-a-days only used by grooms, was once the symbol of power, and waved over the ruler to protect him from evil spirits. The chief Brāhman priests at the sacred pool of Hardwār keeps a wild cow's tail to wave over his clients, and scare demons from them when they are bathing in the Brahmakuṇḍ or sacred pool.[4]

During an eclipse, the cow, if in calf, is rubbed on the horns and belly with red ochre to repel the evil influence, and prevent the calf being born blemished. Cow hair is regarded as an amulet against disease and danger, in the same way as the hair of the Yak was valued by the people of Central Asia in the time of Marco Polo.[5]

---

1. Cf. Crooke, *op. cit.*, pp. 231–2; cf. *Padma P. 5 Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa*, Adh 16 ff.
2. Cf. *Böthlingk—Roth*, under *go*.
3. Cf. Crooke, *op. cit.*, 232.
4. Crooke, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–33.
5. *Ibid*, p. 231; also Yule, *Marco Polo*, ii. 341.

(e). *Immolation of the Cow and Bull*

The problem of the origin of the custom of immolation of cow and the bull is intimately connected with that of the spirit of veneration shown towards them. We have observed that the Ābhīras and Mahāvṛṣas (cf. *infra*) must have belonged to the pre-Vedic or proto-Indian period. And eventually the cow and the bull must have assumed a peculiar importance since then. Besides, we have already shown that the peculiar reverence paid to the cow need not have travelled with the Aryans from the Indo-Iranian region as some scholars would propose it, and that it is probable that the custom of venerating them was of an indigenous origin. In our opinion, the custom of the immolation of the cow and bull was first introduced by the Aryans on their arrival here in India. However, before entering into the details of the question we shall deal with the regular instances of the immolation of the cow and bull during the historical period.

Immolation of Cow and Bull

The *Ṛgvedic Hymn* x. 14 throws some light on the kinds of animals that were offered in sacrifice :

"*He, in whom horses, bulls, oxen and barren cows (vaśā) and rams,*
when duly set apart are offered up.

"*To Agni, Soma-sprinkled, drinker of sweet-juice, disposer,*
with my heart I bring a fair hymn forth."

The bulls and the cows were favourites of Agni.[1] Agni is designated as Ukṣānna or Viṣānna. The bulls were generally killed for purposes of food, and regular slaughter-houses were kept.[2] The ox-hide was used for various purposes. From it again were prepared the bow-string, sling, reins, the lash of a whip, thongs to fasten part of the chariot. It is worth noting that the word '*Go*' is usually used with '*Carman*'.[3]

The funeral ceremony also is associated with the slaying of a cow. The *Ṛgveda* describes," (O corpse) put on the armour, which comes from the parts of the cow, (which will protect thee), against Agni, envelope thyself with (her) thick fat."[4] On this the *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra* details : "Taking out the omentum of the cow called Anustaraṇī he should cover there with the head and the mouth (of the dead person) with the above verse, etc." Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar points out that, 'this peculiar combination of the sense of utility with the sacramental efficiency of the cow did not spring up in the minds of the Aryans after they penetrated and settled in India as the effect of their new environments, but was a feeling which they shared with their Iranian brothers and which they really brought to India."[5]

But as against this, we may say, that the system of polarization of ideas was popular amongst the proto-Indians alone. The above instance shows how the two ideas are brought together i.e. those of fertility and destruction. Hence the idea must have been borrowed by the Aryans from the indigenous people of India.

1. *Ṛgveda*, viii, 43. 11.
2. *Ibid*, x, 89. 14.
3. *Vedic Index*, I. p. 234.
4. *Ṛgveda*, x, 16. 7.
5. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 72.

There are also some instances in the *Ṛgveda* (e.g. words like *Aghnyā* etc.), which show a general tendency towards the non-killing of a cow.

The *Atharvavēda* relates many instances of cow-killing. *A.* V. 18 describes that the Vītahavyas killed the cow, and that they were destroyed on account of the same. Again the hymns vi. 71, iii. 21.6, and xi. 1. speak of the sacrifice of the cow and bull.

The *White Yajurveda* describes in one of the passages: 'Let the Hotar, magnified with oblations, offering sacrifice, worship Sarasvatī and Indra, increasing them with strength, with a bull and cow.'[1]

During the Brāhmaṇa period we find that cow-killing was practised on an increasing scale. The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, while setting forth the Kāmyēṣṭis, discusses the question of the sacrifice of oxen and cows. It describes, 'The sacrifice of a dwarf ox to Viṣṇu, a drooping horned bull with a blaze on the forehead to Indra as the destroyer of Vṛtra, a black cow to Pūṣan, a red cow to Rudra, etc.[2] Again, in the *Pañcaśaradīyāsava*, the important part lay in the killing of seventeen five years old, humpless, dwarf-bulls, and as many dwarf-heifers under three years old.'[3]

The reception of a guest generally took place with the killing of an ox. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, while describing the ceremony of the reception of Soma, relates, 'Even as for a king or a Brāhmaṇa one would cook a large ox or a large he-goat for that is human and the oblation is that of the Gods, so he prepares for him that guest-offering[4]!' This evidently throws light on the origin of the Madhuparka ceremony.[5]

The *Gṛhyasūtras* recommend the immolation of the cow and oxen. We have already noted the instance of the Śūlagava sacrifice. Further the *Āśvalāyana G. S.* relates the rules regarding the performance of the Madhuparka ceremony. 'The personages in whose honour its performance was imperative are a Ṛtvig priest, a Vedic student on his return home, a king and so forth. The most important offering was of Madhuparka. It consisted of honey and curds. The householder rinsed his mouth twice, and sipped a little water. A cow was brought forward and offered to a guest. Having mumbled: 'destroyed be my sin, my sin be destroyed,' he ordered the immolation of the cow, with the word *drū-kuru* (accomplish a man!). But if he chose to let loose, he repeated the Ṛgvēdic stanza, 'Mātā Rudrāṇāṁ, etc.' Āśvalāyana further ordains that the rite is not to be concluded without flesh-meat. 'The Madhuparka ceremony is even prescribed by Manu[6] and Yājñavalkya[7], the latter recommending the immolation of a big ox (mahōkṣa) or a big goat (mahāja). Manu is silent on the point. But he recommends that a Snātaka, on his return, should be honoured with a bull[8], which expression the commentators take as 'with the rite of Madhuparka.'

1. *White Yajurveda*, Bk. xxi.32.
2. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (Bibl. Ind. Ed.), vol. vii, pp. 658 ff.
3. *Ibid*, vol. ii, p. 778.
4. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, iii, 4. 1.
5. D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
6. *Manu*, iii, 119–20.
7. *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti*, i, 109–10.
8. *Manu*, iii, 3.

As D. R. Bhandarkar has pointed out, the killing of an ox formed such an essential part of the hospitality to be shown to a guest that a compound word consisting of two words meaning 'a bull' and 'to kill' respectively was coined to denote a guest. The word *go-ghna*, according to Pāṇini (iii, 4. 73) means 'one for whom one kills a bull i. e. a guest.' [1]

The Dharmasūtras recommend the immolation of a cow. Vasiṣṭha describes that 'among (domestic) animals those having one tooth only, excepting camels, may be eaten. But, while excluding the milch-cows and draught-oxen from the list, he recommends their slaughter only on religious occasions.[2] Āpastamba[3] agrees with the same view in regard to the killing of the milch-cows and draught-oxen. He is in favour of the general prohibition of eating the bovine flesh.

The Dharmaśāstras are specific on this point. Manu recommends the eating of the flesh of all domestic animals that have teeth in one jaw only, excepting camels, which would thus include the cow also.'[4] The commentators Medhātithi and Rāghavānanda have agreed on the same issue.

In later times we find instances of cow-killing. The cow was killed on the return of the bride-groom, being escorted by happy young women. The Kushans practised the immolation of cows and bulls.

The Jātakas also attest to the existence of the immolation. The *Gahapati Jātaka* relates that even respectable villagers felt no scruple in eating cow's meat. The *Munika* and the *Saluka Jātakas* describe that a Kuṭumbika (Vaiśya) is found entertaining his guest on the occasion of his daughter's marriage with the meat of a fattened pig.[5] The *Saṁyukta-Nikāya* (iii.1.9) relates that the Kosala king had arranged a sacrifice of five hundred bulls, five hundred calves and many heifers, goats and rams. Buddha stopped him from doing it.

The Gonds kill a cow at a funeral, and hang the tail on the grove as a sign that the ceremonies have been duly performed. The Kurkus sprinkle the blood of a cow on the grave and believe that if this be not done the spirit of the departed refuses to rest and returns upon earth to haunt the survivors.[6]

Sentiments against Cow-killing

Thus the custom of the immolation of cow and the bull seems to have been in vogue since the Ṛgvedic times onwards. But, in our opinion, there was an orthodox section in India itself which never approved of the idea, and we perceive the same sentiment prevailing later on in the form of the worship of the cow and Nandī, which were not to be killed at all. In regard to the cow it is stated that even the Phœnicians, who are the same as Paṇis, never killed her.

Though the Ṛgvedic bards have generally exhorted the sacrifice of the bull and the cow, still there are some hymns in which the cow is praised. Say the Ṛgvedic passages: 'In the cow's home was born the great eternal' (iii.55.1), of cows as Heaven

1. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
2. *Vasiṣṭha*, xiv, 40.
3. *Āpastamba*, i, 5, 17-29.
4. *Manu*, v. 18.
5. Cf. N. K. Dutt, *Origin and Growth of Caste in India*, i. p. 279.
6. *I. A.*, i, 384 ff.

and Earth (i.144.3 ; ix. 70.6), of cows as rain clouds (iii.1.7 ; 53.16), of cows as rays of light (v.45).' Again the mother of the Maruts is called Pṛśni. Far important than this is the fact, that the cow is also designated as *aghnyā* (not to be killed) in the *Ṛgveda*. This word occurs 16 times in the *Ṛgveda*. The masculine form of the same e.g. *aghnya* used in connection with the bull occurs thrice.[1] Thus there were some people in Ṛgvedic times, who did not cherish the idea of killing cows and oxen. The *Atharvavēda* extols the cow in various hymns (Bk. x.10.26; xii.4.10; etc). The *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*[2] calls the Paṇis as Gopas. And they were called as their enemies by the Aryans. Thus they seem to belong to a race which hated the killing of cows. Again the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is another evidence on this point. The passage describes:

"He (the Adhvaryu) then makes him enter the hall. Let him not eat (the flesh) of either the cow or the ox, for the cow and the ox doubtless support everything here on earth. The gods spake, 'Verily, the cow and the ox support everything here. Come, let us bestow on the cow and the ox whatever vigour belonged to other species (of animals); and, therefore, the cow and the ox eat most. Hence, were one to eat (the flesh of an ox or a cow), there could be, as it were, an eating of everything, or, as it were, a going to the end (or, to destruction). Let him therefore not eat (the flesh) of the cow and the ox. Nevertheless Yājñavalkya said, 'I, for one, eat it, provided that it is tender.'

Further the *Brāhmaṇa-dhammika-sutta* of the *Suttanipāta* makes a strong protest against the killing of cows (26): The cows, that are like goats, do not hurt anyone with their feet or either of their horns, they are tender, and yield vessels (of milk)'. The inscriptions of Skandagupta and his grand-father Candragupta II dated 465 A.D. and 412 A.D. respectively speak of the sin committed on account of cow-killing: 'Whosoever will transgress this grant that has been assigned, (shall become as guilty as) the slayer of a cow, the slayer of a spiritual preceptor, (or) the slayer of a Brāhmaṇa'.[3] Thus the act of cow-killing directly came under the *mahāpātakas*, though Manu and Yājñvalkya had brought it under one of the *upapātakas*.[4]

We also know from the *Harivaṁśa* and other passages, that the cow was respected among the Ābhīras, and that a special heaven was postulated for them, namely, the Goloka.

Conclusion

Thus from what has been stated above, one can very well arrive at the conclusion, that there were a certain section of the people who were against cow or bull-killing since the Ṛgvedic time itself. We further know that the Ābhīras and Paṇis, who are also called Gopas or cowherds, along with the Mahāvṛṣas, were still an earlier race than the Aryans in India. It is just possible that these races were always against the idea of the immolation of these animals. Added to this the Phœnicians also are stated to have 'never eaten the cows under any pretence.'[5] We know that the Phœnicians were the same as Paṇis. Then is it possible that the custom of the immolation of the cow and the bull was not originally in vogue among the non-Aryans?

1. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 151.
2. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, ii.438–440.
3. Cf. *C.I.I.*, vol. iii. (1888), p. 71; *Ibid*, p.32.
4. *Manu*, xi. 60; *Yāj.*, iii. 234.
5. *Prophyry, de Abstin*, ii. 11.

V. THE BULL

Introductory — Bull-worship – Bull in India–Nandī and Siva – Native Accounts– Some Important Topics.

The history of the bull (Greek–'Tauros', Chaldian 'Tur', and Hebrew 'Shir') in the socio-religious life of the Indians is of an absorbing interest. Marshall has pointed out that the cult of the ordinary bull was prevalent in Chalcolithic times throughout Sindh, Punjab and Baluchistan, as proved by a large number of terra-cotta bulls found at Harappa and Mohenjo Daro, and its frequent delineation on pottery.[1] It is also worth noting that there was a pre–Vedic tribe of the Mahāvṛṣas (lit. bull–tribe, or a tribe whose *lāñcchana* was the bull), who are described rather impliedly as the enemies of the Aryans.[2] Besides, various other representations of the bull are found in the Western countries. In Syria there are the carvings of the humped oxen on a wall of the Temple of Ramsses II at Abydos harnessed to a Hittite wagon. Some representations are found in Egypt. It is further interesting to find the representation of the bull with two serpents on the Pro-consular coin of Tralles.[3]

We cannot say when actually bull-worship came into vogue in ancient India. According to Father Heras, a special importance was attached to the bull, when it was added as a constellation by the later Sumerians. And it was since then that the bull is identified with the Sun in the West. The cult of the bull was prevalent in Egypt, Greece, and other countries. 'It was worshipped by the Greeks under the name of Epaphus. Bacchus was sometimes represented as a bull or as a Cross between a bull and a man. The Egyptians held that the soul of Osiris lived in the bull, and worshipped under the name of Apis at Memphis, and under the name of Mnevis at Heliopolis. According to Strabo when an animal conferring to this stipulated description could not be found, an image of gold in the shape of the bull was made and worshipped as though it were the living animal.

Thus 'the worship of the bull was prevalent among the Israelites, Greeks and the Romans. According to Strabo Bacchus was depicted in Greece with the head of the bull, as was too Moloch, the god of the Ammonites; Hebon, the Sicilian God, had the body of a bull; Mylitta was invariably represented as an associate or a consort of the bull. Bull worship is prevalent among the Persians.'[4]

(a). *Bull in India*

In India though the notion of veneration of the bull might have been prevalent since ancient times, as the expression Mahāvṛṣas indicates, still the indentification of the bull with Śiva seems to have come into vogue rather at a later period.

In the *Ṛgveda* the bull is identified with Agni, Indra, Dyaus and Rudra, who is the father of the sons of Pṛśni.[5] Rudra is called Gomṛga[6] in the *Taittirīya*

1. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilisation*, II,Ch.XXI.
2. *Atharvaveda*, V.22.5.
3. Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, Wood-cut No. 2, p.19.
4. Cf. Scott, *Phallic Worship*, pp.179ff.
5. *Ṛgveda*, 5, 52.
6. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, I. 1. 1.

Saṁhitā. The bull appears also as one of the incarnations of Verethraghna.[1] But there are passages in the *Ṛgveda* which point out that the early notion of the identification of the Sun with bull must have been introduced with the arrival of the Aryans in India. One of the Ṛgvedic stanzas describes the Sun as 'the bull that impregnates all cows.' Another stanza runs as follows:

'High on the forehead of the bull, one chariot-
wheel you ever keep,
The other round the sky revolves.'[2]

It is probably this notion that prevails itself during the later period. Eventually, we find for the first time in the *Mahābhārata* that Śiva was endowed by Prajāpati with the bull as a vehicle or *vāhana.* He is the Nandī, Nandikeśvara, or Adhikāra-nandī of later times.

(b). *Śiva and Nandī*

Various accounts are given: how the bull (Nandī) came to be associated with Śiva. The *Mahābhārata* relates a story that 'Prajāpati offered the bull (vṛṣabha) to Śiva to appease him, as he had become enraged on account of the fact that the cows created by Prajāpati were of a similar colour as his own. Mahādēva being pleased made the bull both his vehicle and a device on his banner. It is further said that Śiva is designated as bull-bannered (*vṛṣabha-dhvaja*) mainly on account of this.[3]

In the *Rāmāyaṇa,* Nandī is said to be another manifestation of Śiva.[4] The *Skānda P.* narrates another story. It is told how Nandī was asked by Śiva to watch the doors, how the Devas wishing to see Śiva sent Agni, who went there in the form of a swan, and finally, how Nandī was cursed on that account to descend to the world below.[5] The same Purāṇa narrates another account, namely, that 'on being asked for a boon, Dharma promised that he would become the *vāhana* or vehicle of Śiva. Therefore Dharma is called *vṛṣa-rūpa-dhṛk* (one who has assumed the form of the bull).

The *Kūrma,* the *Liṅga* and other *Purāṇas* narrate how Śiva himself was born as the son of Śilāda.[6] The accounts are as follows:

(1) *Śiva Purāṇa*[7] :—Śālaṅkāyana, who was long without a son, was doing penance under a Śāla tree in a place called Śālagrāma. Appreciating his austerities, Viṣṇu appeared before him and asked him to request for any boon he desired. The Ṛṣi prayed that he may be blessed with a son of great virtue. Immediately after this request was made, a person sprang from the right of Viṣṇu, who resembled Śiva

1. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology,* p. 150.
2. *Ṛgveda,* VII. 106.
3. *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana P.,* 112.30.
4. *Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa,* 16, v. 17.
5. *Skānda P., Avantikhaṇḍa,* 2,20. 13 ff.
6. Gopinatha Rao, *E.H.I.* II, 2, pp. 456-57.
7. *Śiva P. Uttarā-Satarudriya Saṁ.* Adh. 3.

in every way. He was given the name Nandikeśvara. The Purāṇa adds that this was the forty-ninth birth of Nandikeśvara.

(2) *Liṅga Purāṇa* : It narrates the story as follows :

A blind sage named Śilāda was practising penance with a desire to obtain an immortal son, not born of human beings. Indra becoming pleased with the austerities of this sage resolved to fulfil his desire and approached him and told him that no one but Śiva could grant him what he wanted and directed him to address his penances to that deity. He did as advised by Indra, and Śiva pleased with him, promised that he would himself be born to the sage as his son; thereby he intended to satisfy Brahmā also who was desirous of Śiva taking a human incarnation. After some time, Śilāda was engaged in a sacrifice (yāga); a lad preceded from the room in which the sage was performing the *Yāga* ; he looked precisely like Śiva, with a jaṭāmakuṭa on his head, three eyes and four arms. He was carrying in his hands the *śūla*, the *ṭaṅka*, the *gadā* and the *vajra*. Because Śiva became pleased with the fulfilment of his desire by the appearance of this, his son born not by human agency, Śiva gave the lad the name Nandī, and disappeared. Then Śilāda and his son Nandī repaired to the former's *āśrama*. There the boy lost his superhuman form and became quite like any ordinary mortal. Though feeling sorry for the change, Śilāda performed on his son the usual ceremony such as Upanayana, when the boy attained the seventh year of age; he soon became well-versed in the Vedas. Sometime after, two Ṛṣis named Mitra and Varuṇa came to the āśrama of Śilāda as his guest ; these gazed intently at Nandī and perceived through their mental vision that the life of the boy was to come to an end in one year more. They informed this sad news to the father of the boy. The Ṛṣi and his father Śālaṅkāyana sank in despair on hearing the prognostication of their guests and swooned. But, Nandikeśvara, though internally perturbed, began to meditate upon Śiva so intently that the latter appeared to him and took hold of his arms and threw round his neck the flower-garland which was hanging round his own neck. Forthwith the boy was changed into a being endowed with three eyes, ten arms and appearance which exactly resembled Śiva. The latter blessed this metamorphosed Nandī to be free from old age and death and also anointed him as the head of his gaṇas and married him to Suyaśā, the daughter of the Maruts.[1]

(3) A third account also is given as follows: In the Tretā-yuga, a sage named Nandī was performing a severe penance on the peak called Mūnjavān on the Mandāra mountain. Śiva pleased with the devotion of Nandī presented himself before the Ṛṣi. The latter requested Śiva to grant him the boons that he should have unshakable faith in and love for Śiva, as also that he should be made the head of the *gaṇas*. Śiva granted him the boons with pleasure and disappeared. Indra and the other gods were overjoyed to see the bliss that befell the Ṛṣi Nandī and praised him for his good fortune.[2]

---

1. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, pp.456-8; *Linga P. Pūrvārdha*, 47 ff; also *Kūrma P. Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 42.
2. *Ibid*, p. 456.

Thus the bull was considered as a vehicle of Śiva since the time of the *Mahābhārata*. Iconography also may come to our aid in this connection. Allan suggests that the bull standing before a symbol in one of the coins may either represent the bull and the Yūpa or Liṅga.[1] Banerjea gives some other instances : 'A fragmentary sealing or seal impression of the early Gupta period found by Spooner at Basarh shows a very roughly sketched bullock running to right with the crescent moon above. Another unique seal impression shows on the upper edges of its slightly concave surface a small conventional Śaṅkha in outline and a very good humped bull recumbent to left in the middle of the field; the legend is 'Rudra-dēvasya,' 'of god Rudra.' The humped bull again appears on several other seals from Spooner's find at Basarh, with the name of the owner as Rudra-Rakṣita, etc.[2] Further, as we have already stated, the bull with Śiva inclining on it is represented on the coins of the Kushan Emperors and the Kushano-Sassanian Governors of Bactria. The same kind of representation is to be found in the temple at Mahābaḷipuram.

Thus all this data may prove beyond doubt that the idea of the association of the bull (as a vāhana) with Śiva must have arisen in or somewhere round-about the territory of the Mahāvṛṣas, situated in the North-West of India. And as Father Heras observes, the idea must have travelled far and wide in India during the regime of the Kushan and Pallava (who were of Parthian origin) rulers.[3] Eventually the story must have been introduced for the first time in the *Mahābhārata*.

(c). *Some other Aspects*

The Epics and the Purāṇas deal with some of the other aspects of Nandī. In the episode of the sacrifice of Dakṣa he is said to have cursed Dakṣa and other Brahmins and pronounced maledictions against him (Dakṣa).[4] It is related in the *Rāmāyaṇa* that, 'When Nandī was keeping guard over the Kailāsa, Rāvaṇa, the Lord of Laṅkā and of the Rākṣasas, came driving in his aerial car and wanted to cross the abode of Śiva. But he was promptly stopped by Nandikēśvara. Upon this Rāvaṇa made contemptuous remarks concerning the monkey face of Nandikēśvara. Incensed at the insult offered to him, he cursed Rāvaṇa that beings possessing the same shape as himself and of similar energy would destroy the race of Rāvaṇa[5]. Basava, the Prime Minister of Bijjaḷa and the founder of the Vīraśaiva sect, is designated as an incarnation of Nandī[6]. Gopinatha Rao observes that, 'at the entrance of many a temple in Southern India one meets with a pair of images, of which one is a male figure and the other a consort of the former; that the male figure is shaped exactly like that of Śiva in the aspect of Candraśēkhara-mūrti, and that this figure of the Adhikāranandī is sometimes mistaken by the less informed persons for that of Śiva.'[7]

1. J. N. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, p. 121.
2. *Ibid*, pp.196 ff.
3. Heras, *MS*.
4. *Siva P., Rudra-saṁhitā, Sakti-khaṇḍa*, 26, 34, 36.
5. *Rāmāyana, op. cit., Uttarakāṇḍa*, Sec. 16, v. 17.
6. Cf. *Part V, Vīraśaivism*.
7. Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, II. ii, p. 455.

The bull-form of Nandikēśvara is kept lying in front of the central shrine of all Śaiva temples. It is worshipped daily by his followers, and once a year on the occasion of its own festival. The problem of the sacrifice of the bull has been discussed above. The Purāṇas recommend the gifting away of an ox or oxen along with cows to Brāhmins (cf. *supra*). *Vṛṣotsarga*: The liberation of a bull dedicated to Śiva and stamped with his trident is an act of the highest merit, believed to provide a deceased person with a vehicle to the next world.[1] The bull almost flanked by his zodiacal sign, the taurine symbol incarnated the traditional date of Buddha's birth, the day of the full-moon of the month of Vaiśākh. The first Jain Tīrthaṅkara Ṛṣabha's or Ādinātha's sign is the bull. *Bull-fight*: There is a carving on a seal at Mohenjo Daro. It contains a bull-fight scene. Father Heras observes that the scene is similar to those which take place in Spain, and that similar bull-fights have been found represented on the walls of the palace of Minos in Crete, and that it must have been of Dravidian origin.[2] This play was very prevalent in ancient India as can be seen from the fact that 'the Tāmiḷs had a peculiar custom among them of selecting husbands for their girls from the victors of a bull-fight'.[3] The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers to the fact that Kṛṣṇa took part in a bull-fight.

VI. THE BOAR

Sewell points out that all the skeletal remains of the pig that have been found at Mohenjo Daro—and they are many-are of the Indian boar.[4] The animal seems to have been used as an article of food, and hunted by dogs, as it still is in Baluchistan-a sport which was also practised in early Elam as is evident from an archaic seal from Susa.[5] However, the animal seems to have been venerated in later times.

The early non-Aryan nature of the cult of the boar is evident from what is contained in regard to it in the Vedic literature. In the *Ṛgveda*, it is considered as a hostile power which withholds the means of life from Angels and men, and is identified with Viśvarūpa,[6] and with Vṛtra.[7] The Ṛgvedic texts also refer to the killing of the boar by Viṣṇu in association with Indra.[8] Again *Rv.* I.121.11 describes: 'Thou great one (Indra) didst with thy bolt put to sleep the boar, the dragon as he lay in the water-channels'. The *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*[9] narrates that the boar Emūṣa is said to have in keeping the wealth of the Titans, beyond the seven mountains, that would be, apart from the seven worlds, and in accordance with Asurya possession of the food and wealth. In the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* the Boar, who now raises the Earth from the waters, is identified with Prajāpati. This early story was adopted by Vaiṣṇavism by making the boar an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, who lifts up the earth from the waters in the beginning. Śatrughna, the brother of Rāma is said to have shifted the image of Boar from Laṅkā, and installed it at Mathurā.

1. cf. *Garuḍa P. Preta-kha. Dharmakāṇḍa*, Adh.6.14; *Viṣṇudharmottara P.I*,Adh.146, Vs.40ff.
2. cf. Heras, 'Carving on a Steatite', *Journal of Indian History*, p.8.
3. *Kalith-thokai, Stanzas*, 101&111.
4. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilisation*, pl. xcvii.
5. Mackay, *Further Excavations*, I, p. 290.
6. *Ṛgveda*, X 99.6.
7. *Ibid*, I, 61. 6–8.
8. *Ṛgveda*, I. 61.
9. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, II.4.12.

The boar is considered as a sacred animal by the natives in Bāghera.[1] The Prabhus of Bombay eat wild pork once a year as a religious deity. The Vaḍḍars of the Deccan say that they are not troubled with ghosts because the pork they eat and hang in their houses scares ghosts.[2] The Sūkara Kṣetra, situated at Soron on the banks of the Burhi Gaṅgā or old Ganges, is a well known pilgrim centre, wherein the image of Viṣṇu in his Varāha form is installed. Many of the other tribes do not consider the *boar* as a sacred animal. In Rajputana there was a regular spring festival at which the boar was killed because it was regarded as the special enemy of Gaurī, the Rajput tribal goddess.[3]

VII. HANUMĀN (Monkey)

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions refer to a Southern tribe of Kuḍagas, who were later on called as *Vānaras in* Sanskrit. These were the people of Kudagu or Coorg.[4] The Kuḍagas or Vānaras seem to have been so called because their *lāñcchana* or heraldic device consisted of the 'Monkey.' This is directly corroborated by the fact that the famous Kannada poet Pampa definitely states that, 'Sugrīva, Hanumanta (Hanūmat, meaning 'possessing large jaws') and their followers are not monkeys, but human beings whose standard bears the figure of a monkey (Vānara-dhvaja).[5] It should also be noted that the standard of the Kadambas of Banavāse was a flag bearing the figure of a monkey, and called *Vānara-dhvaja.*[6]

The worship of Hanumān, however, seems to have come into vogue rather during a later period. In a late hymn of the *Ṛgveda* a monkey (*Vṛṣākapi*) appears as Indra's favourite, who is expelled for his mischievousness by Indrāṇī, but is finally restored to favour.[7] In the *Atharvaveda* he is described to have monopolized the offerings that should have been presented to Indra.[8]

The monkey-god Hanumān derived popularity from the part he took in assisting Rāma to recover his wife Sītā after she had been carried away to Ceylon by the demon Rāvaṇa. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* he is one of the chiefs of a host of semi-divine monkey-like beings who according to *Rāmāyaṇa* were created to become Rāmacandra's allies'[9].

In the Purāṇic period Hanumān is depicted as having been born of the parents Wind (Pavana or Maruta) and Añjanī. He could assume any form at will, wield rocks, remove mountains, dart through the air, seize clouds, and rival Viṣṇu's divine bird Garuḍa in swiftness of flight.[10] He is worshipped in a greater part of India. In fact he is a very common village-god in the Deccan, Central and Upper India. His images are always smeared with vermillion (sindūra) and oil.[11] The flag flying on Arjuna's chariot bore the figures of Hanumān. The representation of Hanumān is

1. Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, p. 157. 2. *Ibid.*
3. Todd, *Annals*, I. 599; Crooke, *op. cit.*, p. 157.
4. Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, The People and the Land', *Indian Culture*, III.
5. Cf. Rice. *History of Kanarese Literature* p. 35. 6. *Ibid*, fn.
7. *Ṛgveda*, 10, 86. 8. *Atharvaveda*, 126.
9. *Rāmāyaṇa*, 1. 6 ; Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p.220.
10. Monier Williams, *op. cit.*, p.220. 11. *Ibid.*

also to be found on some of the coins of the Rāyas of Vijayanagara (*e. g.* Harihara and Bukka). The Mādhvas possess a great reverence for Vāyu and Hanumān. They even believe that Sodērāja shall become Vāyu in the next Kalpa-the three *avatāras* of Vāyu being Hanumān, Bhīmasena, and Madhvācārya[1]. Hanumān is designated as *Rudrāṁśa*[2] in the Purāṇas.

VIII. THE TIGER

The tiger is also represented on the seals of Mohenjo Daro. Though nothing can be said regarding the early cult of the tiger, still we find that in the Purāṇic times the tiger becomes a vehicle (vāhana) of the Mother Goddess. Śiva is represented as sitting in his ascetic form on a tiger-skin.

The Mother Goddess is known as Vāghāi Devī among the Gonds. The Bhils worship the Vāghakā Kunwar (Tiger-prince), to whom fruit, wine, and sheep are offered.[3] The Vāghēśvar (or tiger-god) is worshipped by the Mirzapur forest tribes. The Santals and the Kisans worship him. The Kurkus of Hushangabad worship the Bāgh Deo.[4] The Bāghēl Rajputs, the Bhils, and the Bajrawat Rajputs of Rajputana claim a tiger origin.[5]

IX. THE LION

The lion is also represented on one of the Mohenjo Daro seals. The animal is never worshipped, though it happens to act as one of the vehicles of Pārvatī, and the rude images of the animal are sometimes placed near shrines dedicated to the Goddess.

X. THE DOG

Mackay observes that the dog was one of the domesticated animals at Mohenjo Daro, which are modelled either in bronze or copper, or in pottery. But the dog does not seem to have been venerated or worshipped in those days.

In later times the dog is closely associated with Bhairon, and it is worshipped also. The story of Yudhiṣṭhira's refusing to enter the heaven of Indra without his favourite dog, which is really Yama in disguise, is too famous to be mentioned here. Crooke observes that the dogs of Yama probably correspond to the Orthos and Kerberos of the Greeks[7].

The dog-worship especially in connection with Bhairon or Bhairobā is very popular in the Marāṭhā country. In Bombay many Hindus worship the dog of Kāla-Bhairava[8]. Khaṇḍērao or Kor Khaṇḍobā or Khaṇḍojī is regarded as an incarnation of Śiva, and much worshipped by the Marāṭhās. He is attended by a dog and accompanied by his wife Malsurā, another form of Pārvatī. In some places Dattātrēya is guarded by four dogs, which are said to stand for the Vedas. There is a festival known as

1. Karmarkar and Kalamdani, *Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka*, p. 88.
2. *Nāradīya P. Pūrvabhāga*, 79, 353.
3. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I,p.72.
4. Crooke, *op. cit.*, p. 213-14.
5. *Ibid*, p. 211.
6. *Ibid*, p. 100.
7. Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, p. 218.
8. *Ibid*.

the Khicha Pūjā in Nepāl, in which worship is done to dogs, and garlands of flowers are placed round the neck of every dog in the country[1].

XI. THE PEACOCK

The peacock is represented in the finds at Mohenjo Daro[2]. In later times the peacock becomes the vehicle of Kārttikēya and Sarasvatī. It is considered as a sacred animal. The peacock is specially venerated by the Jāṭs, who strongly object to seeing the bird killed near their villages, and its feathers are waved in certain ceremonies to ward off evil or demons of disease, or are smoked in pipe as against snake-bite[3].

XII. OTHER ANIMALS

There are also other animals whose representations or remains occur in the Indus Valley finds e.g. the dove, buffalo, rhinoceros, bison, ass, goat, and eagle or Garuda. The dove and the eagle are either venerated or worshipped in later times.

1. All these illustrations are from Crooke. *op. cit.*, II, p. 221.
2. Mackay, *Further Excavations*, I, pp. 296-7.
3. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER X

DENDROLATRY

Proto-India – Ṛgveda – Atharvaveda – Upaniṣads – Epics – Buddhist Literature– Tāmiḷ Literature – Purāṇas – Some Phases.

Tree-worship is of far remote antiquity in India. The various representations on terra-cotta amulets and seals found in the Indus Valley sites, along with the inscriptional data[1] throw light on the wide prevalence of tree-worship during that period. We also learn about the prevalence of this cult amongst the early Druids, and in Greece, France, Poland, Assyria, Africa, America, Polenesia, and other countries.

(a). *Proto-Indian Period*

According to the inscriptional data, there was at least one sacred tree in every city or village.[2] The trees thus venerated were called holy.[3] The trees seem to have been planted near caves.[4] Father Heras observes that the inscriptions describe that some of the trees belonged even to private persons.[5] Three of the famous trees are mentioned as belonging to three political unions of two countries (the Mīnas and Bilavas, the Kāvals, Pagal kalakūr, etc.).[6]

In some caves some holy trees seem to have had properties, the revenue of which was used for the maintenance of the cult.[7]

The inscriptions refer to the *Pipal* tree,[8] to the same tree surrounded by a creeper called Naivel (*Flacourtia Sapida*),[9] and once to the noise of the Pipal tree.[10] The other sacred trees referred to in the inscriptions are the *acacia*, *siris and velvel*.[11] Some of the inscriptions state that the judges used to deliver judgments under a tree.[12] One of the inscriptions refer to the Judging-tree of the Farmer of the Crab.[13] Father Heras observes that, 'very often the tree cult was accidentally or essentially connected with other objects of worship.[14] In one case a king apparently was being worshipped under a Pipal tree.[15] Frequently the cult of trees was connected with the cult of the Sun. One of the inscriptions suggests the time when feasts in honour of trees were celebrated when the Sun was passing above the holy trees.[16] Some of the inscriptions reveal the close connection between the Fish and the holy trees e.g. 'the trees of the Holy Fish.'[17]

1. Heras, 'Tree Worship in Mohenjo Daro', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay, Jubilee Volume.*
2. Marshall, *Harappa*, No.16 and *passim*.
3. Ibid, *M.D.*, No. 423 ; Pl. CXIII, Nos. 418 and 420.
4. Ibid, *M.D.*, No. 423.
5. Ibid, Pl. CXVI, No. 9.
6. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 133.
9. Ibid, *M.D.*, No. 150.
10. Mazumdar, *op. cit.*, Pl. XVII. Cf. Heras, 'Two Proto-Indian Inscriptions from Chanhu Daro,' *J.B.O.R.S.*, XXII, pp. 316-319.
11. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
12. *Ibid*, p. 34.
13. Marshall, *H.*, No. 38.
14. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
15. *Photo, M.D.*, 1928-29, No. 6753.
16. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
17. Photo, *M.D.*, 1930-31, No. 12551.

The different rites in vogue for worshipping the tree were seeing the tree, and meditating on it. Father Heras observes in connection with this, 'after the study of these inscriptions one may easily realize that the spirit of the tree is not the object worshipped when worshipping the tree. Spirits are mentioned in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions,[1] but they are never mentioned in connection with the trees. This idea seems to have originated at a later period. At the time of the period under study trees apparently were being worshipped, as an effect of the fertility of God, produced through the Sun and symbolized by the Fish'.[2] Marshall held a different view.[3]

It is worth noting that a number of human sacrifices used to be performed under the tree. It is said that one of the inscriptions refers to the tree of the God of the Kalakilas. The Kalakilas were people who belonged to the Kolarian stock. In this connection Father Heras observes: 'In point of fact the purity of the religion of the Mohenjo Daro people, and specially the knowledge of the self-subsistence of God which they possessed, evidently suggests that the worship of creatures was an excrescence most likely introduced from outside.'[4]

Archaeological Evidence

It has been rightly maintained by Sir John Marshall that the tree mostly venerated by the Mohenjo Darians was the Pipal tree.[5] Further, the leaves of the Pipal tree are clearly depicted on one of the inscriptions.[6] One of the seals from Chanhu Daro also depicts the same.[7]

Tree of Life

Some of the seals contain representations of 'Tree of Life'. There is also an inscription on one of these seals, which according to Heras means 'of life', or evidently 'Tree of Life.' In connection with these various representations he makes an interesting observation: 'The proto-Indians seem to make the 'Tree of Life' the 'Tree of the Sin'. There was evidently a confusion between the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge, of good and evil, among the proto-Indians. The discovery of the tradition of the sin of paradise among the Indians was not at all strange, though it was certainly unexpected. The tradition existed among the Sumerians It was but natural that it should exist among the ancestors the proto-Indians. But the special apologetic interest of the discovery stands in the fact that the proto-Indian tradition is more similar to the Biblical account than the narration of the tradition contained in Sumerian poems.'[8]

It is also interesting to note that these trees are shown as closely associated with the serpents.[9]

(b). *Tree worship in Literature and Art*

The *Ṛgveda* describes that it is under a tree with beautiful foliage that Yama drinks with the Gods and ancestors.[10] The *Atharvaveda* states that in the third heaven above us stands the Aśvattha tree, the seat of God.[11]

1. Marshall, *M.D.*, 312.
2. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 336.
3. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 64–65.
4. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 336.
5. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 61.
6. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 387.
7. Mazumdar, *Explorations of Sind*, Pl. XVII, No. 34.
8. Heras, 'The Tree of Life', *The Herald* (Calcutta), Sunday, 15-2-1942.
9. Marshall, *M.D.*, 387; *M.D.*, 527, *Further Excavations*, Pl. XC, 13; 23b; Seals 522.524 etc.
10. *Ṛgveda*, X, 131-1.
11. *Atharvaveda*, V, 95.

The *Chhāndogya* and the *Kauṣitaki Upaniṣads* show a keen knowledge of the fig-tree 'which distils the Soma, and the 'Tree of Life' (ilyo-vṛkṣaḥ) of the celestial world'.[1] The *Rāmāyaṇa* gives a beautiful description of the tender care which Sītā took of the Pipal tree. The exact stanza may be quoted as follows :

"Hail, hail, O mighty tree! Allow
My husband to complete his vow;
Let us, returning, I entreat,
Kausalyā and Sumitrā meet.
Then with her hands together placed,
Around the tree she duly paced."[2]

In Buddhist Literature

The *Jātakas* reveal the great importance attached to tree-worship in those days. Offerings were made, and human victims were sacrificed. Trees were consulted as oracles, and expected to grant children, fame and wealth. People used to hang garlands upon the branches of the tree, light lamps round it, and make *bali* offerings at the foot of the tree. It is stated in the *Dummedha Jātaka* that devoted people (*devatā-maṅgalaka*) used to offer sacrifices to the Banyan tree with the entrails, blood and flesh (*māṁsa-lohita*) of the victims—goats, cocks, pigs and the like. The *Droṇasakkha Jātaka* depicts a still more 'horrid picture'. Therein the unhappy princes are knocked unconscious (visanni), their eyes slit out, the bodies (kalebarāṇi) cut open, and the entrails taken out, and the carcasses thrown into the river. The entrails were hung as garlands on the tree, which is marked with spread hands dipped in the blood of the victims (*lohita-pañcaṅgulikāni*).[3]

The sacred Bo-tree is often mentioned in Buddhist works. This is the Tree of Knowledge under which the Buddha attained knowledge. The Bodhi trees were the direct descendants of the *Caitya-vṛkṣas* (*Ṛkkha-chetiyāni*) of primitive times. The Bo-tree of Bodha-Gayā is worshipped now as it was in the days of Aśoka, and the tree at Anurādhapur is the principal object of worship in Ceylon at the present day.[4] The Buddhists, for their part, have quite a great collection of sacred trees; among others, the different Bodhi trees, of which each Buddha has had his own, and four of which already specified are also the object of a special veneration.[5]

In the Mahabharata

The *Mahābhārata* refers to the 'worshipful' village tree,[6] and to the rosary (akṣamālā).[7] In the same Epic Śiva is called *akṣa-mālin* or 'rosary-bearer.'[8] Even Cārvāka is said to have been wearing an *akṣa*.[9]

1. *Cchāndogya Up.*, VIII,5,3,5, *Kauṣitaki Up.*, 1,3.
2. *Rāmāyana*, Canto XIV, quoted by Havell, *Ideals of Indian Art*, p.110.
3. Cf. Mehta, *Pre-Buddhist India*, p.326 for the above information.
4. Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, p.74.
5. Barth, *The Religions of India*, p. 263 fn.
6. *Mahābhārata*, II,24,23.
7. *Ibid*, III, 112,5.
8. *Ibid*. VII, 201, 69.

9. P.T.O.

In Tamil Literature

The early Tāmiḷ literature shows a keen acquaintance with tree-worship. C. V. Narayan Ayyar observes, that the Tāmiḷ word 'Koyil' meaning the 'house of God' is derived from 'Kāvu' or 'Ka', which means a tree, and that this must have some bearing on the idea of a Kṣetra-vṛkṣa.[1] The following names of the temples corroborate the above statement: Tirukkoḍikka, Tirukkolakka, Tirunellikka, Tiruyanaikka, etc. Ayyar further remarks that the purpose now served by the temple was in olden days served only by a tree. The various expressions like Tillaivanam, Ambāvanam, Kollikkāḍu, Saykkāḍu, Talai Alaṅgāḍu, Talaiccaṅgāḍu, Maraikkāḍu, Tiruverkāḍu, Tiru Iḍumba-vanam, Karikkāḍu, and forests, clearly proves the truthfulness of the above remark.[2]

The eminent scholar James Fergusson has given a detailed survey of the vogue of tree-worship in ancient India, especially as it appears at Sāñcī and Amarāvati.

In Early Art

The main trees that are represented as being worshipped were the Pipal (*Ficus Religiosa*), Jack (*Artocarous integrifolius*), and a flowering tree which cannot be identified. It is worth noting that along with the males and females even the monkeys are represented as presenting their offerings to the tree. Fergusson observes that, 'It was in the forest of Daṇḍaka, certainly not far from Sāñcī, that Rāma met with Hanumān, the god-like monkey who played so imortant a part in the subsequent records of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. If a monkey could fight in Hindu tradition side by side with men, why in Buddhist forms should they not pray with them.'[4] Fergusson is partly correct, because we have already observed that the 'monkeys' really meant the ancient Kuḍagas, who were a proto-Indian tribe. It was since the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa* that they began to be described as real monkeys instead of the people belonging to the Kuḍaga tribe.

By way of illustration we can quote just one instance of tree-worship in those days. Fergusson describes the figure on Plate XXV as follows: 'The tree is the Pipal, the true Bo-tree of the present Buddha. A temple has been built around it, and it is represented as growing out of its windows. In front is an altar, on which is the Triśūla emblem. Above the tree is the ennobling Chatta, and on either hand Garudas or Devas bearing offerings. Below on each hand, are two male worshippers in the costume of the Hindus.'[5] Some of the other representations show that even kings used to worship the Bo-tree.

The Yaksis and Vrksakas

Though in the proto-Indian period the tree itself was worshipped in its natural form, we find later on that 'the tree spirit was personified and endowed with human shape and human attributes'. These are indeed the Yakṣis and Vṛkṣakās. Coomaraswamy observes, 'The commonest and most characteristic type, indeed, is that of the nude or semi-nude female figures associated with trees, unmistakable descendants of the Yakṣis and Vṛkṣakās of Bharhut, Bodhgayā and Sāñcī, and ancestors of the Rāmeśvaram verandah brackets at Elūrā, those of the Vaiṣṇava cave at Bādāmi, and many later

---

1. *Ibid*, *Sānti P.*, 38,23.
2. Cf. C.V.N. Ayyar, *Śaivism in South India*, pp.309ff.
3. *Ibid*.
4. Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, p.117.
5. *Ibid*, p.115.

derivatives.... They are certainly not, as they used to be called, dancing girls; they are Yakṣīs, Devatās or Vṛkṣakās, nymphs and dryads, and to be regarded as suspicious emblems of vegetative fertility, derived from popular beliefs. Trees are closely connected with fertility, and tree-marriages have survived to the present day; the twining of the limbs of the dryads, as in the Bodh Gayā pillar, deliberately or unconsciously expresses the same idea'.[1] The Purāṇas also throw light on the topic. The *Skānda P.* ordains that the Vaṭa-yakṣiṇī, who resides in the Vaṭa (Fig-tree), should be worshipped[2].

Banerjea gives some instances of the representations of the Kalpa-druma. He says, 'The Banyan capital, which is usually dated 3rd century B. C., must have been originally placed on the top of a column standing in front of a shrine of Kubera-Vaiśravaṇa, whose special cognisance was a bag, a vase full of coins.... I have counted the number of objects coming in a downpour as it were from the Kalpadruma and have found in all there eight such: a conch-shell, a lotus, two vases: all exuding coins and four more or less similar bags or purses, their necks tied round by strings, the idea being that they are also containing treasures'.[3] The number of the treasures of Kubera varies according to different authorities.

In the Puranas

The various Purāṇas have given details in regard to tree-worship.[4] The main trees that are often referred to in these works are the Pipal (*Ficus religiosa*), the Vaṭa or Banyan (*Ficus Indica*), Aśoka, Aska, Śamī (*Acacia*), the Dūrvā grass, Padma, Āmra (Mango), Nīm, Bakula (*Embli myrobalan*), Śrīvṛkṣa (Bilva), Karavīra, Tulasī plant, etc. The Purāṇas enjoin also many Vratas e.g. *Aśoka-vrata*,[5] *Śrīvṛkṣa*,[6] *Dūrvāṣṭamī*,[7] Karavīra,[8] Vaṭasāvitrī-vrata (15th of Jyeṣṭha), etc. The Purāṇas also enumerate a list of sacred fruits e.g. the cocoanut etc. It is described therein that the Vaṭa is sacred to Kāla, the Pipal or Aśvattha tree to Śiva or Kṛṣṇa, the Bilva to Śiva, the Aśoka to Śiva, the Arka to the Sun, Śamī, who was a goddess herself, and the Dūrvā to Gaṇeśa. According to the version of some of the Purāṇas the divine Pārijāta tree arose out of the ocean at the time of Amṛtamanthana. This is called Kalpadruma or Kalpavṛkṣa. It should also be noted in this connection that the famous Śākuntalam describes the trees of the sacred grove as yielding beautiful robes and costly ornaments for the adornment of the heroine.

The *Skānda P.* gives an interesting description of the close association of the trees with gods. It says that, 'Viṣṇu in the form of Vaṭa, Vidhātā or Brahmā in that of Palāśa; the Śaktis in that of Āmra (Mango); Indrāṇī and others in that of creepers, and Urvaśī and others in the form of Mālatī and other flower-creepers.'[9] Besides, the following description is very significant: Kṛṣṇa is said to have died at the

1. Coomaraswamy, *H.I.I.A.*, p. 64.
2. *Skānda P. Kaumārikā Kh.*(2), Adh. 62.
3. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, p. 116.
4. *Bhaviṣya*, II, I, 10.
5. *Ibid*, 4, 105.
6. *Ibid*, 4, 60.
7. *Ibid*, 4, 56.
8. *Ibid*, 4, 10.
9. *Skānda P. Vaiṣṇava-khaṇḍa, Kārttika Māhātmya*, Adh. 3.

foot of the Aśvattha tree[2]. At the end of every Yuga the Lord Nārāyaṇa is said to lie down on a Vaṭa leaf[3]. It should be noted that the Banyan (*Ficus Indica*) is highly venerated in Polynesian Islands, in the various parts of Indian Archipelago, in Northern Australia, in Egypt (*Ficus Sycamorus*), Greece and Italy, and some of the other countries.

(c). *Some Other Aspects*

The tree within railing is found on Āndhra coins of Western and Southern India *i.e.* where the Cuṭus ruled as feudatories and subsequently as independent sovereigns. It is absent on the coins from Eastern India. The *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and other allied works give various descriptions in regard to the magic property in the trees, demoniacal influence, etc.

The tree is described to have been closely associated with the serpent. Crooke observes that in accordance with his ideas of metempsychosis, every tree and plant has a personality of its own and is treated, therefore, as a conscious human being. Thus, for example, it is usual before cutting a tree to ask the pardon of the indwelling spirit; and the non-Aryan Gonds will not shake a tree at night or pluck its fruit for fear of disturbing the sleeping spirit.[5] Every Śākta after rising in the morning pays respect to the Kula tree.[4] There are frequent instances of the close association of the tree with marital rites. The girls among many non-Aryan tribes are first married to trees before being united with husbands.[6] The trees themselves are solemnly married to each other.[7] The various Purāṇas relate the story of Tulasī with the Śālagrāma stone, a symbol of Viṣṇu.[8] Among the Marāṭhas the *devaks* or marriage guardians have still a share in the marriage rite. 'The Devak is usually some common tree such as the *bel*, fig, banyan or the Śamī. In its commonest form it is the leaves of five trees, of which one, as the original *devak* of the section, is held specially sacred. It is worshipped especially at the time of marriage.[9] Hewitt observes that Mariammā is a tree-goddess, that the practice of marrying brides can be traced to the matriarchal conditions, when tree-marriage was not recognized. Crooke remarks that the idea behind these marriages is to bring the bride and bridegroom into close association with the fertility of nature.[10] According to the present notions a tree can also be tenanted by some alien deity, or, may be, by the spirit of a man or even of an animal and not infrequently by a malignant spirit or demon.[11] Tree-worship is in vogue in modern times also.

---

1. Cf. also *Vāmana P. Adh.* 171 ff , which gives a different version.
2. *Bhāgavata P.* XI, 30, 42.
3. *Ibid*, III, 33, 4.
4. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folklore in Northern India*, p. 401.
5. Canda, *Indo-Aryan Races*, p. 135.
6. Hewitt, *J. R. A. S.* 1899, pp. 338-9; Crooke, *op. cit.*, pp. 416-17.
7. Oppert, *Original Inhabitants of India*, p. 492.
8. *Brahmavaivarta P. Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, 15, etc.
9. *E.R.E.*, XII, p.454.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 331.

PART III

THE VRATYA RITUAL

CHAPTER XI

RITUALISTIC PRACTICES

The Proto-Indian Period – Ritual in Āgamas, Tantras, Purāṇas – Some General aspects.

(a). *The Proto-Indian Period*

It has been aptly said that, 'Ritual is the art of religion'. It was generally supposed that the pre-Ṛgvedic period was mainly busy with *animistic beliefs*, and eventually, all the beginnings of the Indian ritual were being traced from the Ṛgvedic period. But the relics found on the proto-Indian sites have really thrown a wonderful light on the history of the pre-Aryan Gods, temples and ritual. In fact, it can be emphatically stated now that the Mohenjo Darians had an independent religious cult of their own–which was generally called *anyavrata* by the Vedic bards. It is really from this that the later systems of ritual must have drawn inspiration.

Proto-Indian Temple

In regard to the structure of the temple during the proto-Indian period, Father Heras observes: "The temple of the Sun carved next to an inscription[1] seems to be small and square, only containing the shrine of the Sun. The roofing is flat but in the four corners four spike-like finials break the flat line of the edifice. In front of the temple there was an open porch in front of which a double awning protected the worshippers from the Sun and from the rain. At the very end of the porch-roof just over the awning, there is another finial of the same type. The corner of this design has placed the object of worship in the temple in the porch, so that it could be fully seen. It is the disc of the Sun here placed over a throne as if meaning that the Sun was the Supreme Ruler of the universe ...... Other temples were perhaps larger. They were generally built in the centre of the town towards which all the main steets converged.[2] The inscriptions state that the temple had servants[3] amongst whom there were the temple guards.[4] The temples enjoyed properties for the maintenance of the cult. These properties generally were houses or land, and are spoken of as belonging to the gods themselves. The inscriptions indicate that taxes and tributes also were fixed for the benefit of the temples. Further one of the inscriptions states, "In eight houses (there are) six trident temples",[5] a fact which implies that some private houses apparently having small shrines were attached to them.[6]

Archæological Data

The Mohenjo Daro relics also throw light on the various poses (Mudrās), Āsanas, and the various modes of worship that had come into vogue in those times. During this period all the gods were

1. *A.S.I. Report*, 1929–30, Pl. XVIII, No. 11466 (8).
2. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People *etc*'., *B.U.J.*, V. I, pp. 23–24.
3. Photo *M.D.*, 1928–29, No. 7135.
4. Photo *M.D.*, 1928–29, No. 6389.
5. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 227.
6. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

represented nude. Banerjea observes in regard to the scene, erroneously described by Marshall as the 'epiphany of the tree-spirit,' as: 'the hands are, however, not joined together as they should be in the *Sampuṭāñjali* pose'. He further points out that several of the terra-cotta human figurines that were discovered at Harappa distinctly portray it: 'No. 6, is a squatting male figure with folded hands, No. 7 is seated with hands folded in devotional attitude, No. 8 is a rough figure seated on its haunches with arms clasped about the knees and hands folded in worship, Nos. 9 and 10 also show male figurines with their hands folded above the breast.'[1]

There are some seals containing the figures of the god seated in a *yogic* posture, on whose either side kneels a human devotee with the serpent lifting itself behind him (cf. *Supra*). The unique representation of the Trimūrti figure of Śiva shows that he is seated on a throne. This reminds us of the later Pīṭha. In the various figures we see that Śiva has armlets which are eleven in number and has a pectoral-like object hanging from the neck and adorning the breasts. Some of the representations markedly show the common vogue of the depiction of the Prabhāvali.[2]

Modes of Worship

The various Mohenjo Daro inscriptions indicate that seeing any object worthy of veneration, and thinking or meditating on a sacred being, were taken to be equivalent to acts of worship.[3] It is further interesting to note that one of the inscriptions refers to three vows or solemn promises taken by a man.[4] The sprinkling of a sacred object with water, or any other object, was considered as an act of worship. The proto-Indians used to practise the rite of human sacrifice (cf. *infra*).

Theocratical Government and Priesthood.

Father Heras makes an interesting observation. "The Government of Mohenjo Daro," he says, "was theocratical. God was supposed to be the king of the country. The king was only an administrator on behalf of God and he received the title of 'the Farmer,' and since Mohenjo Daro was called 'Nanḍūr,' the 'city of the Crab,' the complete title of the king was *Nand ulavan Nandil ulavan* i. e. 'the Farmer of the Crab.'"[5]

Thus the king was considered to be the minister of God and was naturally entrusted with the office of priests.[6]

Feasts

The proto-Indians observed some feasts also *i. e.* the Nandal, known as Pongal in modern times, and other feasts on the day of 'the growing half of the moon' or Full-moon day, *etc.*"[7] In this connection Father Heras observes, 'it appears that a trident or perhaps an image having a trident on its head, was transferred from village to village in the country

1. Cf. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, p. 274.
   Cf. also Vats, *Excavations at Harappa*, p. 294, Pl. LXXVI.
2. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization*, I, Pl. XII, 13,14,19.
3. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions,' *J. U. B.* V. I, p. 22.
4. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 431.
5. *Ibid*, *M. D.*, No. 419.
6. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
7. *Ibid*, pp. 26-27.

and remained in each village for a year. The story of the image or trident in the village was undoubtedly marked with special festivals.'[1] Marshall also refers to vessels which must have acted as incense burners.[2]

(b). *Ritual in the Āgamas, Tantras and Purāṇas*

Introductory—The Sākta Ritual—Some other aspects.

Immediately after the period of the proto-Indian period we begin to find almost a blank in the history of the Vrātya ritual. No doubt, the *Yajurveda*, the *Atharvaveda* and later on the Gṛhyasūtras must have drawn a good deal of inspiration from the ritual lore of the proto-Indians. But the main works that deal with the Vrātya ritual are the Āgamas, Tantras and other allied works. The Purāṇas are replete with Āgamic and Tāntric ritual. It should, however, be noted that like the *Atharvaveda* the later Dravidian documents deal also with magic in general. The Ḍāmara and other works contain elements of Black Magic (*Abhicāra*). With the adoption of the Vrātya ritual by the Purāṇic writers, a clear-cut distinction came to be made between the Vedic and the Vrātya forms of ritual. And it is said that there are three kinds of worship, which are of equal importance e. g. Vedic (*Vaidic*), Tāntric, and mixed (*miśra*).[3]

Amongst different modes of worship of the five Devatās (Pañcopāsanā), namely, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Gaṇapati, Śakti and Sūrya, the Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and the Śākta are the most important. The following elements are common to them all: Upacāra, Yajña, Vrata, Tapas, Maṇḍala, Śuddhi, Mudrā, Dhyāna, Saṁskāras, etc.

Puja

The word worship is designated by various names: Pūjā, Arcā, Arcana, Vandana, Saparyyā, Arhaṇa, Namasyā, Bhajana, etc. The Pūjā comes under the *Kāmya* sacrifices.

The Pratika

In a Pūjā ceremony there must always be placed before one something as a representation of the object of worship, called Pratīka or Pratimā in Sanskrit, which may be an external one (Bāhya-pūjā) or a mental one (Mānasa-pūjā). It may be an image of god or goddess or an emblem of the same e. g. Kalaśa, Śālagrāma (in case of Viṣṇu worship), the Liṅga and Yoni, or Gaurī-paṭṭa (of Śiva with Devī), or a metrical design called the Yantra.

Upacara

Then follows the Upacāra consisting of the materials used or things done. These are generally sixteen: (1) *Āsana* (seating of the image); (2) *Svāgata* (welcoming of the Devatā); (3) *Pādya* (water for washing the feet); (4) *Arghya* (offerings which may be general or sāmānya and special or Viśeṣa) made in the vessel; (5) *Ācamana* (water for sipping and cleansing the lips offered twice); (6) *Madhuparka* (honey, ghee, milk and curd), (7) *Snāna* (water for bathing); (8) *Vasana* (cloth or garment); (9) investing it with a sacrificial string; (10) *Ābharaṇa* (jewels); (11) *Gandha* (perfume); (12) *Puṣpa* (flowers); (13) *Dhūpa*

1. *Ibid*, p. 27.
2. Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, p. 69.
3. *Bhāgavata P.*, XI, Adh. 27, 7. The exact stanza is as follows:
वैदिकस्तान्त्रिको मिश्र इति मे त्रिविधो मखः । त्रयाणामीप्सितेनैव विधिना मां समर्चयेत् ।

(incense); (14) *Dipa* (light), (15) *Naivedya* (food); and (16) *Vandana or Namaskriyā* (prayer).

The Āgamas, the Purāṇas and other works give also details in connection with the particular articles to be offered to a particular deity, e. g. the Bel or Bilva leaves and Kalhāra flowers to Śiva; the Tulasī leaf to Viṣṇu, the scarlet hibiscus (Jabā) to the Goddess, *etc*. The Mantras may vary according to the deity to be worshipped.

Avahana and Prana-pratistha

In a worship the welcoming (*āvāhana*) and life-giving (*prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*) ceremonies, and at the conclusion, the act of the bidding of the deity to depart (*visarjana*) are essential.

The expressions Mudrā, Āsana, Japa, Maṇḍala, etc. connote the same thing in all the modes of worship. Every system preaches the necessity of the Dīkṣā, or the ceremony of initiation, at the hands of the Guru. The Caryāpāda of the Āgamas speaks of three kinds of Dīkṣās e. g. the Śaiva-dīkṣā, the Samaya-dīkṣā and the Naiṣṭhikī-dīkṣā, respectively.

(c). *The Śākta Ritual*

A Śākta must practise Sādhanā under the direction of a human Guru or Spiritual Teacher. It is frequently described in the Tāntric texts that this Guru happens to be the manifestation on earth of the Supreme *Guru*—Ādinātha Mahākāla and Mahākālī.[1] The disciple ought to posses the following qualifications : purity of soul (śuddhātma), control of the senses (jitendriya), the following of the aims of all sentient beings (puruṣārtha-parāyaṇa). And, on the other hand, those who are lewd (kāmuka), adulterous (para-dārātura), addicted to sin, ignorant, slothful and devoid of religion should be rejected[2]. The Tantras make no differentiation on grounds of caste. In fact the initiation may be given to a member of any caste. Even women are allowed to act as a Guru and give the necessary initiation Dīkṣā.

The Preceptor must first of all give initiation to the disciple. It is very aptly stated that 'Guru is the root (Mūla) of initiation (Dīkṣā); Dīksā is the root of Mantra; Mantra is the root of Devatā; and Devatā is the root of Siddhi.'[3] It should also be seen by the Guru whether the Mantra is *akula* or *svakula*. The *Kulagurus* are said to be four in number-each of them being the Gurus of the preceding ones. There are three lines of Gurus.[4]

There are other initiations or consecrations (abhiṣeka) and they mark greater and greater degrees of advance from Śāktābhiṣeka, when entrance is made on the path of Śāktasādhana to Purṇadīkṣābhiṣeka, which is also called Varajāgrahaṇābhiṣeka. After attaining perfection the Sādhaka performs his own funeral rite (*Śrāddha*), makes *purṇāhuti* with his sacred thread and crown lock. He then becomes a Jīvanmukta or Parama-haṁsa ; and the distinction between the preceptor and the disciple ceases altogether.[5]

1. Woodroffe, *op.cit*., p.492.
2. *Ibid*, p. 493; cf. also *Matsyasūkta Tantra*, XIII, *Mahārudrayāmala*, I, XV. I. ii ; *Kulārṇava*, Ch.XIII, etc.
3. Cf. Woodroffe, *op. cit*., p. 495.
4. *Ibid*; cf. also *Mahānirvāṇa*, p,111.
5. *Ibid*.

The Śāktasādhakas are divided into four classes e.g. Mṛdu, Madhya, Adhimātṛka, and the highest Adhimātrama, who is qualified for all the forms of (Yoga). Eventually the Śākta-kaulas also are divided into the *Prākṛta* or common following; *varācāra* with the Pañcatattvas; the middling (Madhyama-kaula), who follows the same or other sādhanā,—but who is of a higher type; and the highest Kāula (*Kau'ikottama*), who, having surpassed all ritualism, meditates upon the universal self.[1] The Śākta-worship (Pūjā) is of four kinds according to the four different classes of worshippers e. g. (1) Brahma-bhāva, (2) Dhyāna-bhāva (through Yoga process), (3) Japa (recitation of the Mantras or hymns of praise), and (4) the Bāhya-pūjā (or external worship) which is the lowest of all.

Cakra-puja

One of the essential features of the Śākta ritual consists of the *Cakra-pūjā* (Circle-worship) or otherwise called Cīnācāra. It should also be borne in mind that if Śāktism is condemned for any of its defects it is for the innovation of this most obscene form of worship prevalent amongst (though not all) the Śāktas.

The worship of the Pancatattva takes place 'in a circle or Cakra composed of men and women, Sādhakas and Sādhikās, Bhairavas and Bhairavīs, sitting in a circle, Śākti being on Sādhaka's left. A Lord of the Cakra (*Cakreśvara*) presides sitting with his Śakti in the centre. There is no distinction of caste in a Cakra-pūjā.'[2] There are various kinds of Cakras e.g. *Cūḍā-cakra*, in which fifty Siddhavīras and fifty Siddha-śaktis meet, *Ānanda-bhuvanayoga*, in which the *Vīra* is surrounded by one hundred and eight Śaktis, *Ūrṇā-cakra*, in which the Vīras sit in pairs tied to each other with clothes, the *Tattva-cakra* for the Brahma-kaulas, the *Bhairavī-cakra*, in which 'in lieu of wine, the householder takes milk, sugar, honey (*Madhustraya*), and in *lieu* of sexual union does meditation upon the lotus feet of the Divine Mother with Mantra, etc. The Goddess may be represented by an image or a Yantra, which is actually a drawing of the *pudendum muliebre* in the centre of a circle formed of nine pudenda'.[3]

The Pancatattva, also called Kuladravya or Kulatattva, consists of the five elements e.g. wine (Madya), meat (Māṁsa), fish (Matsya), parched cereal (Mudga), and sexual union (Maithuna). They are also vulgarly called Makāras, as they begin with the letter *ma*. These various Tattvas form the acts of drinking, eating and meditation.

Woodroffe observes that, 'the meaning of the Pañcatattva differs according to the Tāmasika (*Paśvācāra*), Rājasika (*Vīrācāra*), or Sāttvika (*Divyācāra*) sādhanas respectively. Wine is only wine, and Maithuna is only sexual union in the ritual of the Vīra. To the Paśu the Vīra ritual (Vīrācāra) is prohibited as unsuitable to his state, and the Divya, unless of the lower kind of ritual, is beyond such thing. Thus the Pañcatattva is three-fold: real (*Pratyakṣa-tattva*), substitutional (*Anukalpa-tattva*), and symbolical or divine (*Divya-tattva*).[4]

1. Woodroffe, *Ś.Ś.*, p.492.
2. Woodroffe, *S.S.*, p.573.
3. Farquhar, *O.R.L.I.*, p.203.
4. Woodroffe, *S.S*, pp. 566–67.

All the Mantras, before they are offered, must be first purified and consecrated. The person selected must not be ignorant, irreligious and of lewd disposition. Both of them must be on the same level of understanding, ability and intelligence. The same thing is required in the performance of the Ṣoḍhanyāsa.

Śaktis are described to be of two kinds, namely, Bhogya–those who are enjoyed, and Pūjya-those who are worshipped only. The Kumārī-pūjā (or Virgin-worship) is widely prevalent amongst the Śāktas. In the Brahmarājayoga there takes place only the worship of the virgins.

Abuses of the System

The system of Circle-worship has been condemned by scholars in general. Monier Williams observes, 'In Śāktism we are confronted with the worst results of the worst superstitious ideas that have ever disgraced and degraded the human race. It is by offering to women the so-called homage of sensual love and carnal passion, and by yielding free course to all the grossest appetites, wholly regardless of social rules and regulations, that the worshippers of the female power (Śakti) in Nature seek to gratify the Goddess representing that power, and through her aid to acquire supernatural faculties, and even ultimately to obtain union with the Supreme Being'.[1] Wilson expressed that, 'in justice to the doctrines of the sect, it is to be observed that these practices, if instituted merely for sensual gratification, are held to be illicit and reprehensible as in any other branch of the Hindu faith.'[2] Woodroffe states that, 'generally speaking, we may distinguish not only between Dakṣiṇācāra and Vāmācāra in which the full rites with wine and Śakti are performed, but also a Vāma and Dakṣiṇa division of the latter *ācāra* itself. It is only on the former side that there is worship with a woman other than the Sādhaka's own wife.'[3] Indeed, it is true that some of the Tantras have tried to give an allegorical meaning of the five Tattvas. For example, the *Mahānirvāṇa* says that, "the Sādhaka is the cup or vessel which is the individual Ego. 'This-ness' is offered to the Supreme. Drinking is an offering to that Fire which is the transcendant self "whence all individual selves (*Jīvas*) proceed. Wine is then Tārā Dravyamayī, that is, the saviourness Herself in the form of liquid matter."[4] In spite of these indications we may firmly assert that the most condemnable practices must have once held their full sway in Śāktism.

Its origin

The problem regarding the origin of the Cīnācāra or Circle–worship has been a matter of hot controversy. Some scholars have held that it is a product of Buddhism. Others have proposed that these rites originally came from Yellow Asia, penetrated into India where they received its impress, and again made the way to the North to encounter earlier original forms. Woodroffe expresses the view that rites may be a continuance, though in another form, of ancient Vaidic usage in which Soma, Meat, Fish and Puroḍāśa formed a part, and that though there are some Maithuna rites in the Vedas, it is possible that the Bengal Śākta ritual in this respect has its origin in Cīnācāra.

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 192.
2. Wilson, *Religious Sects*, p. 163.
3. Woodroffe, *S.S.*, p. 350.
4. *Mahānirvāṇa T.*, XI, 105–107; cf. also *The Kaula T.* etc.

The first view, namely, that the *Cakra-pūjā* is a product of Buddhism cannot be convincingly proved, because we know definitely that the process is just the other way i. e. that Buddhism must have been the borrower of the Śākta ideas from Hinduism. In regard to the argument put forth by Woodroffe, there is also a legend which supports his theory. According to the legend, Vasiṣṭha is said to have gone on the proposal of Kāmākhyā to Viṣṇu, who is in the form of Buddha (in the form of *Udbodharūpī*) residing in the country of *Mahācīna*. Buddha is said to have ultimately taught him the *Cīnācāra* consisting of the five Makāras.[1] Mainly basing his argument on the above story, Woodroffe says, that 'it is noteworthy that the flower of the Devī is Jabā, the scarlet *Hibiscus* or Chinese rose, which may indicate that it is perhaps not indigenous to India but to China whence it may have been imported possibly through Nepal.'[2] But we have already seen that the Mother Goddess among the Vrātyas in the Vāhīka country was worshipped with wine, etc. These Vrātyas were none else than the non-Aryans themselves. Hence there is every possibility that the later Cīnācāra system seems to have been a development of this cult of the Mother Goddess. It need not have actually been imported from China–the expression Cīnācāra being applied to the Circle-worship absolutely later on, especially when it had amalgamated itself with the local customs in China and other countries.

Bhuta-suddhi

Bhūta-śuddhi is an important Tāntric rite, which purifies the five elements of which the body is composed. Monier Williams interprets the expression as 'removal of demons'.[3]

Nyasa

The Nyāsa, which is a very important and powerful Tāntric rite, is the mental assignment of various parts of the body to the protection of tutelary presiding deities, with the imposition of the hands or fingers, and the repetition of texts and mystical words and the use of symbols.[4] The four divisions of the Nyāsa are : inner (*antar*), outer (*bahir*), and according to the creative (*sṛṣṭi*) and dissolving (*saṁhāra*) order. There are many kinds of Nyāsas : Jīva-nyāsa, Mātṛkā or Lipi-nyāsa, Ṛṣi-nyāsa, Ṣaḍaṅga-nyāsa (Hṛdayādi-ṣaḍaṅga-nyāsa and *Aṅguṣṭhādi-ṣaḍaṅga-nyāsa*), Pīṭhanyāsa, etc. The *Kulārṇava* however describes six kinds of Nyāsas.[5] The actions of the Nyāsas are supposed to stimulate the nerve centres and to effect the proper distribution of the Śaktis of the human frame according to their dispositions and relations, preventing discord and distraction during worship, which itself holds steady the state thus induced.[6]

Mantra

'A Mantra', says Woodroffe, 'consists of certain letters arranged in definite sequence of sounds, of which the letters are the representative signs. To produce the desired effect, the *Mantra* must be intoned in the proper way according to both sound (*varṇa*) and rhythm (*tvara*). For these reasons a *Mantra* when translated ceases to be such, and becomes a mere word

---

1. Woodroffe, S. S., 179 ff. ; cf. also *Rudrayāmala and Brahmayāmala T.*
2. Woodroffe, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
3. Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary.*
4. *Briggs, Gorakhnāth and the Kānaphāṭa Yogis*, p. 178.
5. *Kulārṇava-T.*, IV. 20.
6. Woodroffe, *Ś. Ś.*, p. 518.

or sentence.'[1] The Mantras are divided into four catagories e.g. friendly, serving, supporting and destroying (Siddha, Sādhya, Susiddha, and Ari).

Japa

Japa or meditation is the utterance or recitation of a Mantra according to specific rules. Its three kinds are: Kāyika, Vācika and Mānasa-japa. The *Puraścaraṇa* consists of the japa of the *Mantra*.

Sandhya

Like the Vedic there is also a Tāntric Sandhyā.

Yajna

There are four kinds of Yajñas or sacrifices prevalent amongst the Śāktas e. g. Deva, Bhauta, Nṛ-yajña, and Pitṛ-yajña. The Śāktas count the Pañcatattva ritual as forming a *Yajña*. The most common Yajña is the Deva-yajña-homa rite.

Samskaras

The *Mahānirvāṇa* deals with the following ten Saṁskāras: Garbhādhāna, Puṁsavana, Sīmantonnayana, Nāma-karaṇa, Niṣkramaṇa, Anna-prāśana, Cūḍā-karaṇa, Upanayana, Mantra-dīkṣā (in the Tāntric ritual), and Udvāha.[2]

Nila-sadhana

The Nīla-sādhanā or Black Magic is practised by some Vīra-sādhakas alone in the cremation ground. Woodroffe describes it as follows: The Vīra trains himself to be indifferent and above all fear. A leading rite is that called *Śava-sādhanā* which is done with the means of a human corpse. The corpse is laid with its face to the ground. The Sādhaka sits on the back of the body of the dead man on which he draws a Yantra and then worships. If the rite is successful it is said that the head of the corpse twines round and asks the Sādhaka what is the boon he craves, be it liberation or some material benefit. It is behind that the Devī speaks through the mouth of the corpse which is thus the material medium by which she manifests Her presence. In another rite, the corpse is used as a seat (*Śavāsana*). There are sittings also (*āsana*) on skulls (*Muṇḍāsana*) and the funeral type (*Citāsana*).[3]

The Yantra

The most distinguishing feature of the Tāntric worship is the use of the Yantra, which takes the place of the image or emblem at a later stage. The Yantra is 'a diagram drawn or painted on paper, or other substances, engraved on metal, cut on crystal or stone. The magical treatises mention extraordinary Yantras drawn on leopard's and donkey's skin, human bones and so forth.' Woodroffe draws a distinction between a Yantra and a Maṇḍala thus: 'whilst a Maṇḍala may be used in the case of any Devatā, a Yantra is appropriate to a specific Devatā only.' Monier Williams has given very interesting details regarding the Yantra. He says, 'These Yantras or mystic diagrams are thought to be quite as effective in their operation as the Mantras, and of course a combination of both is held to be absolutely irresistible. An enemy may be killed or removed to some other place, or a whole army destroyed, or salvation and supreme felicity in a future state obtained by drawing a six-sided or eight-sided diagram and writing a particular Mantra underneath. If this be done with the body of an animal killed sacrificially in

1. Woodroffe, *Ś. Ś.*, p. 229.
2. *Mahā-nirvāṇa T.*, Ch. IX.
3. Woodroffe, *S. S.*, p. 530.

a place where corpses are burnt (*smaśāna*), no power on earth or heaven can resist the terrific potency of the charm. Triangular, pentangular and nine-triangled Yantras are equally efficacious. The representation of the Goddess in the form of a triangle seems to have travelled even to the West.[1] Baal is represented in the form of a triangle.

The Kavacas

The Purāṇas are replete with descriptions regarding the *Kavaca* or amulet or talisman which is on the neck, breast, arms, or loins worn as a preservative against evil influences, pestilence and sickness, or to bring about the attainment of some desired object. It may consist of a stone, piece of paper, metal, leaf or other material on which Mantras, Yantras, Mystical words and formula of various kinds are inscribed. Women often wear *Kavacas* with the object of propitiating the Goddess, and so inducing a condition of body favourable to the production of male off-spring. The Kavaca is also applied to whole hymns when they are used as charms.'[2]

We need not enter into the details of the other elements of Śākta-sādhanā, for instance, Tapas, Dhyāna, Sevā (which is both *Sthūla* and *Sūkṣma* e.g. gross and subtle), etc.

(d). *Some other aspects of Ritual*

It has been said that, 'the Vaiṣṇava mode of worship is the best and of a *sāttvic* type; the Māheśvara or Śaiva is Rājasic and is associated with the Bali offering; and the Tāmasic, which is observed by the Kirātas and other tribes, includes sacrifices of animals and human beings.'[3]

Worship of Siva in different forms

The *Śaivāgamas* describe that the Śaivas worship Śiva in the aspects of Tāṇḍava-bhūṣaṇa; the Pāśupatas, Śiva smeared with ashes and wearing Jaṭāmakuṭa; the Mahāvratas, Śiva wearing a garland of bones; the Kālāmukhas, Śiva wearing *sphaṭika* and *putra-dīpa* beads; the Vāmācāris, Śiva wearing the sacred thread and carrying fire; and Bhairavas, Śiva carrying *ḍamaru* and wearing anklets, and that all these aspects of Śiva should have three eyes.

The Pancayatana Puja

Perhaps immediately after the writing of the *Atharva Upaniṣad*, which contains an adoration to Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā, Sūrya, Gaṇeśa, the cult of the Pañcāyatana seems to have come into vogue. The Smārtas generally perform this worship. The following information is important: Images, or stone and metal symbols, or diagrams, or earthenware pots, may be used to represent the divinities. The image or symbol of the god whom the worshipper prefers is placed in the centre, and the other four are so set as to form a square around the central figure. The more used symbols are: Viṣṇu, the Śālagrāma pebble; Śiva, the Narmadeśvara pebble; Devī, a piece of metal, or the Svarṇarekhā stone found in a river in South India; Sūrya, a round piece of Sūryakānta i.e. Sun-stone, or of Sphaṭika i. e. crystal; Gaṇeśa, the Svarṇa-bhadra, a red slab from a stream

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 203.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Cf. *Kālikā P.*, 65, 47–49 ff.

near Arrali.'[1] The system has lost its vogue in Gujarat and the Tāmiḷ country. In Smārta temples, the mode of worship is Vedic.

The Purāṇas make again a distinction between the worship of a Kuladēvatā and an Iṣṭa-dēvatā, the chosen or tutelary deity of the house. 'Among the Brāhmans the Iṣṭadevatā is that god of the Pañcāyatana, which is placed in the centre.'

(e). *Worship of the Goddess in various forms*

The Goddess Devī is worshipped in many forms. She is variously named sometimes according to her imagined age; thus when she is worshipped as an year-old baby, she is known by the name of Sandhyā; if she is conceived to be two years old, she is called Sarasvatī; if of seven years of age, Caṇḍikā; if of eight years of age, Śāmbhavī, if of nine years of age, Durgā or Bālā; if of ten years of age, Gaurī; if of thirteen, Mahālakṣmī; and if of sixteen, Lalitā.[2]

It is worth noting that the worship of the village gods and goddesses is carried on generally by non-Brahmin priests. Thus the Pūjāris or Bhōpīs or Vīravēśins consist mainly of a Pariah (Caṇḍālaputra), a Mādiga, the Āsādis, etc. Though one may find in a temple a Brāhman priest here and there, still the main act of sacrificing the animals is carried on by the priests of the lower castes. Krishna Sastri has given some interesting details in regard to the ceremonies peculiar to these temples. They are: 'fire-walking, swinging on the *sidi* with a hook passed through the skin during what is otherwise known as the Cakra-pūjā, lashing oneself with a whip, piercing a metallic wire right through the tongue or through the sides of the mouth, slashing at the breast and forehead with swords until the blood spurts out, thrusting a spear through the abdomen, and carrying on head the Karagam, lumps of ghee, or earthen pots with blazing fire in them. But when infectious diseases among men and cattle prevail, special worship is arranged for, to appease the deities by sacrificing animals, offering heaps of cooked rice mixed with blood, or by carrying the Karagam.'[3]

Festivals

The principal festivals that are enjoined to be observed are as follows: Śiva-rātrī on the 14th day of Māgha (Dark-half); Śitalā-ṣaṣṭhī, Śalākāpañcaka, Śākāṣṭamī, Hoḷi festival (on the 15th day of Fālguna) in honour of Kāma, Kṛttikotsava, Narakacaturdaśī, Dīpāvalī, Balipratipadā and Traipura-utsava, Durgā Pūjā (in the month of Āśvina), Mahānavamī, Nāgapañcamī, Gaṇeśacaturthī, Caitrapratipadā, Kārttika Paurṇimā, Makarasaṅkramaṇa etc. The festivals enumerated in the *Padigam* (Tāmiḷ) are: Aippaśi oṇam, Kārtigai, Mārgaḷi, Tiruvādirai, Taippūśam Māśikkaḍalāṭṭu, Paṅguni Uttiram Aṣṭamī, Parāppu, etc. These were surely very old festivals common to all Śiva temples.[4] The principal festivals of the left-hand worshippers are: (1) The night of the Kṛṣṇa-janmāṣṭamī, called the Kālarātrī; (2) the Moha-rātrī, or Kālīcaturdaśī, kept on the fourteenth day of the second half of Āśvina; (3) the Śiva-rātrī or Mahārātrī, kept on the fourteenth of the dark-half of Māgha; (4) the Dāruṇī Rātrī, kept on the day before the Hoḷi festival, which is on the fifteenth day of the first half of Fālguna Besides, nine nights in each of the months Āśvina, Caitra, Pauṣa and Āṣādha are

1. Farquhar, *O.R.L.I.*, pp. 293 ff.
2. Gopinatha Rao, *op cit.*, I. ii. p. 333.
3. Krishna Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 226.
4. C. V. N. Ayyar, *Saivism in Southern India*, p. 136.

also observed as holy nights. The Purāṇas enjoin that the respective days (Tithis) of the month, which are favoured by the respective deities, are as follows: Gaṇeśa-Caturthī (4); Nāga-pañcamī (5); Kumāra-Ṣaṣṭhī (6); Sun-Saptamī (7); Śambhu-Aṣṭamī (8); Caṇḍī-Navamī (9); Rudra-Ekādaśī (11); Viṣṇu-Dvādaśī (12); Ananta-Trayodaśī (13); and Śambhu-Caturdaśī (14). The *Matsya P.* states that Śaṅkara is worshipped in every month through the whole year under the following designations: Śaṅkara, Śambhu, Mahēśvara, Mahādēva, Sthāṇu, Śiva, Paśupati, Ugra, Śarva, Tryambaka, Hara and Īśāna.[1]

The Purāṇas describe the following Vratas and Pūjās as important: *Somavāra-vrata* (of Śiva and Umā),[2] *Cīrṇa-vrata*,[3] *Nakṣatrākhya-vrata* (on the 13th of Mārgaśīrṣa), *Māhēśvara-vrata*,[4] *Ādityaśayana-vrata*,[5] *Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī-vrata*,[6] *Virūpākṣa-vrata*[7] (14th day of the dark-half), *Saubhāgya-śayana-vrata*,[8] *Lalitā-vrata*,[9] *Umā-Mahēśvara-vrata*[10] (on 3rd of Mārgaśīrṣa bright-half), *Sāvitrī-vrata* (15th of Jyeṣṭha)[11] *Kṛttikā-vrata*,[12] *Umā-vrata*;[13] and the following worships: *Bhadrakālī*[14] (eighth of the bright-half of Āśvina), *Surabhi*,[15] *Kumārīpūjā*,[16] *Mātṛgaṇas*,[17] *Gaurī*, *Caṇḍikā*, *Kālī*, and others.

(f). *Animal and Human Sacrifice*

We have observed in the different portions of this work how the rite of animal sacrifice was in vogue in ancient times. The most popularly sacrificed animals were: the goat, buffalo, camel, cock, pig, rhinoceros, and others (Cf. under *Human Sacrifice*). The rite of animal sacrifice had absolutely nothing to do with totemism as Whitehead seems to suggest. It should also be noted in this connection that Manu recommends an oblation to Śrī and Kālī (of course not exactly a sacrifice of animals).[18] We shall deal with the problem of the human sacrifice later on.

(g). *Other Topics*

The Purāṇas deal with various topics in regard to gifts, endowments, etc. to the temple. They speak of the Dīpadāna ceremony (lighting of lamps in the temple) and other topics. The use of the following objects is also recommended: the application of ashes (Bhasma or Vibhūti), the making of the three streaks (Tripuṇḍra) on the forehead, wearing the rosary of Rudrākṣa, holding the Tridaṇḍa (in the case of a Sannyāsin), *etc.* The Purāṇas enumerate the names of various Kavacas or amulets i.e. Śiva Kavaca, Dēvī Kavaca, Bāṇa Kavaca, etc.

The various Purāṇas and other Indian records give different details in regard to the worship of the demons like the *grahas* of Skanda, the Bhūtas, Pretas, Piśācas, etc.

1. *Matsya P.* Adh. 56.
2. *Skānda P. Prabhāsa-kṣetra-Mā.* 25,6.
3. *Agni P.* 83. 41.
4. *Bhaviṣya P.* 4, 47.
5. *Matsya P.* Adh. 55.
6. *Vāmana P.* Adh. 16.
7. *Viṣṇudharmottara*, III Khaṇḍa, Adh.188.
8. *Bhaviṣya*, 4, 25.
9. *Ibid*, 4, 20.
10. *Ibid*, Adh. 22.
11. *Bhaviṣya*, 1, 102, 86.
12. *Ibid*, 4, 103.
13. *Harivaṁśa*, 2, 77, 10 ff.
14. *Viṣṇudharmottara*, II, Adh. 158.
15. *Brahmavaivarta, Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, 47, 6.
16. *Ibid*, IV, 1, 145.
17. *Viṣṇudharmottara*, III, Adh. 222.
18. *Manu*, II, 89 ; XII, 121.

Superstitions generally include 'all those practices or cults of religious or semi-religious reverence, which have no proportion with the aim expected through them, and which accordingly cannot have been instituted or presupposed by god at least in ordinary circumstances.'[1]

Some Superstitions

The Indus Valley finds also disclose the existence of many varieties of amulets e.g. amulets to obtain prosperity (including those which contain the representations of Svastikas, etc.); amulets to obtain ruin; amulets to obtain fecundity; amulets to obtain victory over the enemy; and others.[2] In the modern days amulets are generally tied to the wrist, to the neck, to the shoulders, or to the waist. We have partly dealt with this problem under the title of the Kānphāṭa Yogis.

1. Heras, *MS.*
2. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XII

HUMAN SACRIFICE

Proto-Indian period - Later History.

The institution of Human Sacrifice evidently seems to be of pre-Aryan origin in India. The various Mohenjo Daro finds fully indicate the existence and wide prevalence of the cult. In later times, however, the cult seems to have spread far and wide in the whole world. We find the early traces of the same in Greece, Italy, among the Celts, Teutons and Slaves, the Phœnicians and Egyptians, the early Japanese, many African tribes, South Sea Islanders, some American tribes, and particularly the Mayas and Aztecs.[1]

Like all the other sacrifices, the institution of human sacrifice conveyed the far deeper meaning, namely, that of sacrificing the best at the altar of God. The motive in doing so may be many-sided. We know that Hariścandra made an attempt to offer a human victim i.e. Śunaḥśepa, in sacrifice, for the sake of saving his own child. Herodotus gives an interesting account regarding the significance of the cult. While relating the story of Cyrus who was bent upon throwing Crœsus, the king of Lydians, along with fourteen other prisoners on the funeral pile, he observes that, 'I know not whether Cyrus was minded to make an offering of the first fruits to some God or other, or whether he had vowed a vow and was performing it, or whether, as may well be, he had heard that Crœsus was a holy man, and so wished to see if any of the heavenly powers would appear to save him from being burnt alive.'[2] Besides we find that the cult was practised for achieving many other objects also. The cult was practised by both the high and the low.

(a). HUMAN SACRIFICE

Amongst the Proto-Dravidians

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and representations on the seals indicate the main proofs in regard to the prevalence of this cult. Father Heras rightly observes that, 'these words are never found in the inscriptions. Yet when one observes that the number of the deceased persons is always the same or at least repeated in certain proportion, one at once realizes that the inscriptions speak of real human sacrifice.'[3] The persons to be sacrificed were kept in prison and treated as temple prisoners.[4] Once they were kept in a palm-grove.[5] One of the seals[6] represents how seven victims, fully decorated, were kept ready for the sacrifice. They are shown to have worn flowers or perhaps feathers over their heads. They are dressed and are shown

1. *E.R.E.*, VI, p. 840. It should be noted that we have used the word 'Phœnicians' instead of 'Semites'. The cult of human sacrifice was prevalent among Phœnicians alone.
2. *Herodotus*, I. 86.
3. Heras, '*The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to Inscriptions*', *Jour. of the University of Bombay*, Vol. V. Pt. I., p. 23.
4. Marshall, *M.D.*, Pl. CXVI, No. 6.
5. *Photo, M.D.*, 1928-29, No 6628.
6. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization*, I. Pl. XII. 18.

to have worn shoes. The sacrifice used to take place under the trees — the corpses being afterwards taken away by two *bandis* to the burial ground.[1] The inscriptions relate that the number of human victims was generally either seven or a multiple of seven.[2] It is of immense interest to note that the number seven, as applied to the human victims, became current in later times in India as well as in the Western world. We shall examine the point presently.

Account of Herodotus

Just before the time of Zoroaster, it is told how Crœsus, the king of the Lydians, was imprisoned and thrown on the burning pile. Herodotus relates the account as follows: 'Thus was Sardis taken by the Persians and Crœsus himself fell into their hands, after having reigned fourteen years, and been beseiged in his capital fourteen days; thus too did Crœsus fulfil the oracle, which said that he should destroy a mighty empire, by destroying his own. Then the Persians who had made Crœsus prisoner brought him before Cyrus. Now a vast pile had been raised by his orders, and Crœsus, laden with fetters, was placed upon it, and with him twice-seven of the sons of the Lydians.[3] The account is interesting especially because it states facts belonging to the pre-Zoroastrian age.

Story of the Citpavans

The story of the origin of the Citpāvans also is very interesting. Here is one of the accounts given by Monier Williams regarding the tradition: 'A tribe of Brāhmans in the Konkan called Cit-pāvans is said to have been created by Paraśurāma thus: After his contest with the Kṣatriyas he took up his abode in the mountains of that part of India. There he had a quarrel with some Brāhmins who resided with him in the same region. Then to spite them he went to the sea-shore, and finding fourteen funeral piles (*Citās*-Caityas) with the remains of a number of persons who had been burnt, resuscitated them and converted them into Brāhmins.[4]

Puranic data

The Purāṇic data also is useful in this connection. The *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* describes that, 'It is said that the Goddess Lalitā wore a garland of the seven heads of the Rākṣasas by means of weaving their hair into each other and created a shrilling noise.'[5] Perhaps this refers to the tradition of offering the heads of seven human victims.

Atharvaveda

The *Atharvavēda* maintains the tradition as follows:

"Seven victims held the sacrificial essence,
The bright one and the one that hath grown feeble.
The three and thirty deities attend them
As such, conduct us to the world of *Svarga*.[6]

It should be noted here that though the word seven is interpreted as meaning seven different kinds of victims including men and animals, still, in our opinion, this must have originally referred to the tradition of the sacrifice of seven victims.

1. Marshall, *H.*, No. 11. 2. Cf. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
3. *Herodotus*, I. 86.
4. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 271 *fn.*
5. *Brahmāṇḍa P. Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 24, 98. 6. *Atharvaveda*, xii. 316.

Best of all, the famous Hymn on the Primeval Being[1] or the *Puruṣa-Sūkta* contains a specific reference in regard to the significance of the number seven. It states that at the time when Puruṣa was being sacrificed,

Rgveda

"Seven fencing sticks had he, thrice-seven layers of
fuel were prepared,
When the Gods, offering sacrifice, bound, as their
Victim, Puruṣa. (15).
"Gods sacrificing, sacrificed the victim : these were the
earliest holy ordinances.
The mighty Ones attained the height of heaven, there
where the Sādhyas, Gods of old, are dwelling." (16).

The *Puruṣa-sūkta* is but a mystic glorification of the human victim who already stands sacrificed. If this be so then it actually points to an old custom belonging to the pre-Aryan times. The remarks made in the hymn that 'these were the earliest ordinances' are instructive.[2]

Some of the Megalithic tombs in Southern India contain the contracted bodies of seven persons.[3] Crooke gives an interesting instance. He says, that when Hindus have removed the ashes from a burning ground they write the figures 49 on the spot where the corpse is cremated.[4] The story of Kaṁsa killing the first seven children of Vasudēva, Kṛṣṇa's father, should really throw some light on the ancient custom of sacrificing seven victims. The story of Dēvavrata is narrated as follows: Dēvavrata sees a maiden on the Ganges. He marries with her on condition that he would never interfere with any of her acts. After their marriage, as soon as the child was born, she threw it into the Ganges; and this she did to seven children, one after another. But on her doing about the eighth, the king prevented her. She was Gaṅgā. She said that they belonged to Vasus, and that therefore she wanted them to be sent to heaven soon.

Later instances

Thus all the above instances show how the system of sacrificing seven (or a multiple of seven) victims was widely prevalent in ancient India.

Cult of Human Sacrifice belonged to Non-Aryans

Both the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions and later writings prove beyond doubt one factor, namely, that the cult of human sacrifice must have been originally practised by the non-Aryans and that if the Aryans have mentioned instances of the same, it must have been on account of the gradual flow of the non-Aryans into the fold of Aryanism itself. The following arguments may be adduced in support of the same:

1. *Rgveda*, x, 90, 15-16.
2. Cf. Karmarkar, '*The Puruṣa-Sūkta or the Mystic Glorification of the Human Victim*,' *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, 1941.
3. E.g. The tomb No. XVII of Raigir. Cf. Hunt, 'Hyderabad Cairn Burials and their significance'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, LIV, p. 148.
4. Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, 51.

(1) We have already referred to the prevalence of the cult among the Mīnas and other tribes in the Mohenjo Daro period.

(2) The Paṇis are another Vrātya tribe of Ṛgvedic fame. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* mentions a story, that the king of the Vṛṣalas performed the human sacrifice according to the custom prevalent among the Paṇis.[1] This must really have been a reminiscence of the ancient tradition. The story is related as follows:

'Once upon a time, a king of the Vṛsalas (Vṛṣalīpatiḥ), desirous of having a son, undertook to sacrifice a male human being for the propitiation of Bhadrakālī. By chance the sacrificial male beast secured for the purpose was let loose and could not be found out at the time of sacrifice. Thereupon the followers of the leader of Paṇis ran hither and thither in search of the object of the sacrifice. In their frantic they proceeded towards the field at dead of night covered with darkness and by chance they came to see the decrepit Bharata while he was engaged in protecting the field having stationed himself on high in a particular subtle way. The followers of the Vṛṣalīpati found him gifted with auspicious marks and thought that he would serve well the purpose of their master's sacrifice. Then they bound him (Bharata) with ropes, and with delightful countenance they proceeded towards the altar of the Goddess Kālī where their master was awaiting them. According to their rules they got Bharata bathed, clothed him with a new piece of cloth and be bedecked decked him ornaments, fragrant garlands and marks of *tilaka*. Then having fed him and worshipped him with presents of incense, lamps, garlands, fried paddy, new leaves, fruits and tender roots, they, chanting aloud the glories of the Goddess Kālī and playing Mṛdaṅgas and Paṇavas brought him before the Goddess Bhadrakālī, and made him sit there with his face downwards. Thereupon the priest of the king, to worship the Goddess Bhadrakālī with the blood-like Āsava of that male beast being purified with incantations, took up a dreadful dagger. The minds of those Paṇis were possessed by the qualities of darkness and ignorance and were filled with the pride of riches.' Later on, it is told how Bhadrakālī saved Bharata from slaughter.

(3) In the *Brahmavaivarta P.* it is stated how the Tāmasic Pūjā (worship) through human sacrifice was practised by the Kirātas and other tribes.[2] The Purāṇa further describes that the person to be sacrificed must also bear horns (*Sa-śṛṅgaḥ*).[3] Is this the same as the horn-like trident placed over the head of Śiva?

(4) *Story of Jarāsandha*[4]: The *Mahābhārata* states that Jarāsandha had imprisoned one hundred kings and kept them in the temple of Paśupati at Vāraṇāvata situated in Magadha, on the opposite side of the Ganges. It is said that they were to be slaughtered like 'cattle', but they were saved later on. Jarāsandha is described as an Asura. Hence he must have evidently belonged to the non-Āryan race.

1. *Bhāgavata P. Fifth Skandha*, Adh. 9, vv 12 ff.
2. *Brahmavaivarta P. Prakṛti Kh.*, Adh. 94.
3. *Ibid*, Adh. 94, v. 96.
4. *Mahābhārata*, II, 15, 23.

(5) The practice of the cult was in vogue amongst many of the lower tribes in India.

(6) *In Aryan Documents.* The early instance of Śunaḥśepa (rather implicitly referred to in the *Ṛgveda*),[1] who was saved from being sacrificed as a human victim at the instance of Hariścandra,[2] is a clear indication of the fact how the Aryans were showing a keen dislike towards the rite. Further the famous chapter on Purusamedha in the *Yajurveda* mentions, among other victims, the Vrātya, Puṁścalī and Māgadha.[3] This evidently proves the keen hatred of the Aryans against the practice of human sacrifice. Besides, as we have pointed out above, the *Puruṣa-sūkta* throws a clear indication on the fact of the existence of the cult in the pre-Aryan days.

Thus all these instances are clear proof of the fact that the rite of human sacrifice must have been popularly in vogue amongst the proto-Indians and that the Aryans must have adopted it later on.

(b). *Human Sacrifice in early Literature*

The *Ṛgveda* contains two indications regarding the practice of the cult. The Hymn I. 24 of the *Ṛgveda* is addressed to Varuṇa, Prajāpati, Savitar and Bhaga. It is attributed to Śunaḥśepa, son of Ajīgarta. Therein the poet is addressing Varuṇa to save him from his Pāśa (or bondage). In the opinion of scholars this forms a nucleous of the story of Śunaḥśepa and Hariścandra related in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. The *Brāhmaṇa* relates the story as follows: 'A king named Hariścandra worships Varuṇa in order to obtain a son, promising to sacrifice to him his first-born. A son is born, named Rohita; but the king delays the sacrifice until Rohita grows up, when his father communicates to him his intended fate. Rohita refers submission and spends several years in the forest away from him. There, at last, he meets with Ajīgarta, a Ṛṣi in great distress and pursuades him to part with his second son Śunaḥśepa to be offered, as a substitute, to Varuṇa. Śunaḥśepa is about to be sacrificed when, by the advice of Viśvāmitra, one of the officiating priests, he appeals to the Gods, and is liberated.'[4] The story is referred to in many Purāṇas.[5] Further, the *Puruṣa-sūkta* (X. 90) happens to be a mystic glorification of the victim who already stands sacrified (cf. *Supra*).

Next, the Puruṣamēdha described in the *Vājasanēyī Saṁhitā* (XXX) indicates how the human sacrifice was celebrated for the attainment of supremacy over all created beings.[6] In this sacrifice eleven human beings and eleven barren cows were offered up. Various gods along with the victims to be offered to them are mentioned. It is worth noting that the Puruṣamedha refers to the Vrātya, Puṁscalī and Māgadha

---

1. *Ṛgveda*, I. 24. 2. Cf. *infra*. 3. *Vājasanēyī Saṁhitā*, XXX.
4. Cf. Wilson, *Ṛgveda*, I, p. 60, Muir, *O. S. T.*, I. 355, 407, 413; and Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 408.
5. Cf. *Bhāgavata P.*, IX. 165, 28ff; *Vāyu P.*, Adh. 91,94ff; *Devī-Bhāgavata P.*, VII, Adh. 12ff; *Mārkaṇḍeya P.*, Adhs. 7-8. 6. *E.R.E.*, VI, p. 849.

as being fit persons to be sacrificed. The *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* (iii. 4), the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (xiii. 6), the *Śāṅkhāyana* (xvi. 10–16) and *Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtras* (xxxvii. f.) throw further light on the problem.

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* requires the immolation of a human being at the time of performing the Aśvamedha.[1] As Weber points out, 'the *anaddhā Puruṣa* is not a fiction; for that, on certain occasions, instead of this 'man of straw' a real victim was offered, is shown by the ritual manuals and by *Brāhmaṇic* texts. The man who is slaughtered must be neither a priest nor a slave, but a warrior or a man of the third caste.'[2] The *Mahābhārata* refers to the story of one hundred kings who were imprisoned and made ready by Jarāsandha for being sacrificed in the temple of Paśupati.[3]

(c). *The Purāṇic Literature*

The Purāṇic literature abounds in instances or exhortations regarding the practice of human sacrifice. The *Padma P.* narrates how in the Dvāpāra Yuga a king named Dīnanāth was advised by Gālava to perform the sacrifice for obtaining a son.[4] The *Kālikā Purāṇa* gives very interesting details regarding the performance of the human sacrifice: 'Having placed the victim before the goddess, the worshipper should adore her by offering flowers, sandal paste, and bark, frequently repeating the *Mantra* appropriate for sacrifice. Then, facing the North and placing the victim to face the East, he should look backward and repeat this *Mantra*: "O man, through my good fortune thou hast appeared as a victim; therefore, I salute thee; thou uniform and of the form of a victim. Thou, by gratifying Caṇḍikā, destroyest all evil incidents to the giver. Thou, a victim, who appearest as a sacrifice meet for the Vaiṣṇavī, hast my salutations. Victims were created by the self-born himself for sacrificial rites; I shall slaughter thee to-day, and slaughter as a sacrifice is no murder". Thus meditating on that human-formed victim, a flower should be thrown on the top of its head with the *Mantra*: "O sword, thou art the tongue of Caṇḍikā and bestower of the region of the gods. Black and holding the trident, thou art like the last dreadful night of creation; born fierce, of bloody eyes and mouth, wearing a blood-red garland salutations be to thee". The sword, having thus been consecrated, should be taken up while repeating the *Mantra*: "*Am hum phaṭ*" and the excellent victim slaughtered with it. Thereafter, carefully sprinkling the blood of the victim, water, rock-salt, honey, aromatics, and flowers, it should be placed before the goddess, and the skull also, with a lamp burning over it, should be placed before her with the *Mantra*: "Om, Aim, Hrīm, Śrīm, Kauśikī, thou art gratified with the blood".

It is again stated in connection with the sacrifice of animals and human beings: 'Birds, tortoises, alligators, fish, nine species of wild animals, buffaloes, bulls, he-goats, ichneumons, wild bears, rhinoceros, antelopes, iguanas, reindeer, lions, tigers, men, and blood drawn from the offerer's own body, are looked upon as proper oblations

---

1. *Śatapatha Brā.*, XIII. iii. 6, 5, etc.
2. Cf. Weber, *Episch in Vedisch Ritual*, p.777.
3. Cf. *supra*.
4. *Padma P. Brahma-Khaṇḍa*, 12, 3 ff.

to the goddess Caṇḍikā. By a human scrifice, attended by the forms laid down, Devī is pleased 1,000 years, and by the sacrifice of three men 100,000 years'.[1]

Bāṇa, the famous author of the *Kādambarī* refers to the sale of human flesh.[2] The *Mālatī-Mādhava* of Bhavabhūti relates how Mādhava, the hero, tries to win the favour of the ghouls of the cemetery by an offering of human flesh, and comes upon a temple of Cāmuṇḍā just in time to save his love Mālatī from being sacrificed to the Goddess by Aghoraghaṇṭa, the priest, and his acolyte, Kapālakuṇḍalā.[3] This is a singular instance wherein a female is meant to be sacrificed. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva gives many instances of human sacrifice in honour of Caṇḍikā or Cāmuṇḍā. 'One Muravara, a Turushka or Indo-Scythian, proposes to make a human sacrifice in memory of his dead father. We have expiatory sacrifices to Caṇḍikā to save the life of a king.'[4]

Again instances of cannibalism are not wanting in Indian literature. All the demons (Rākṣasas) are always depicted as being cannibals. The legend of king Kalmāṣapāda, how he was cursed by Vasiṣṭha to become a cannibal, is too famous to be mentioned here in detail.[5]

(d). *Kālī and other Goddesses*

The Tāntric texts have both 'approbated and reprobated the system of Human Sacrifice.' There are numerous instances of the observance of this cult. Almost till the advent of the British rule, one victim used to be sacrificed every Friday in the temple of Kālī at Tanjore.[6] Many rulers and chieftains performed the sacrifice at the temple of Kālī. The Marāṭhās were keen observers of this cult. In A. D. 1830, it is said that at the famous shrine of Danteśvarī in Baster upwards of twenty-five men were immolated by the Rājā on a single occasion. The cult was also common in the North-East of India. About 150 persons were immolated by the Koch King Nar Nārāyan (16th cen.). The Haft Iqlim states that in Koch Bihar persons called Bhogīs sometimes offered themselves as victims.[7] The same custom was followed in the Jaintia Paragaṇas. Here, the head, which was cut off, used to be placed before the goddess on a golden plate, and the lungs used to be cooked and eaten by such *Kāndrā Yogis* as were present, and the royal family partook of a small quantity of rice cooked in the blood. In the absence of voluntary victims other persons were actually kidnapped.[8]

Vogel has observed that the sculptural representations of South India throw light on the 'prevalence of the practice of self-immolation by a head-offering to *Devī* (Goddess)'.[9] The Chuṭiyas and their successors Āhoms practised the cult on a large scale. The custom was popular among the Dravidian tribes of the Chota Nagpur plateau. The Khoṇḍs used to offer victims to Tari Pennu, the earth-goddess, to avert

1. Cf. *E. R. E.* VI, p. 850. i. ; also *Asiatic Researches*, V (1897), 371 ff.
2. *Harṣacarita*, pp. 92 f., 136, 263.
3. Cf. also Payne, *The Śāktas*, pp. 42-43.
4. Cf. Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, p.168; also. Tawney, *Kathāsaritsāgara*, i.336,5; ii.253,338 etc.
5. Cf. also Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, p. 168.
6. *E. R. E.*, VI, p. 850.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Bulletin of the London School of Oriental Studies*, VI, pp. 539-43; Minakṣi, *Pallavas*, pp.182ff.

misfortune and disease, to obtain success in war, and especially to ensure success and good crops.[1] The practice was also current among many of the Mongoloid tribes in the Nāga hills and on the Patkoi. Further, the Bhumij used to kidnap children and sacrifice them at the shrine of their goddess Rāṅkiṇi. The Bhuyiyas used to offer sacrifices before Ṭhākurāṇī Māi. Malcolm states that the Karhāḍā Brāhmins used to sacrifice to their deities a young Brāhmin every year.[2] In the seventeenth century, the Śikhs confer that the great reformer Guru Govind prepared himself for his mission by the sacrifice of one of his disciples to Durgā[3]. The Rājā at Jaipur, near Vizagapattam, at his installation in 1861, is said to have sacrificed a girl to Durgā.[4] The Tāmiḷs of Ceylon,[5] and the Banjāris and Kois of the Telugu country practised the cult[6] till recently.

When the Portuguese first settled at Calicut, the Koṭṭakkal Cruisers surprised a Portuguese vessel and sacrificed all their prisoners on rock, which is even now called as the 'Sacrifice-rock (*Thoovak-kal* or *Vallaikal* 'the white rock').[7] *The Tāmiḷ Country*—The *Śilappāthikāram* relates a thrilling incident. It describes: 'From that memorable day on which Kovilan was beheaded, there was no rain in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom; and famine, fever and small-pox smite the people sorely. Verivel-Cheliyu, who held his court at Korkai, believing that these misfortunes were brought on by the curse of Kaṇṇaki, sacrificed one thousand goldsmiths at her altar and performed festivals in her honour. Copious rain then fell and famine and pestilence disappeared from the kingdom.'[8]

To Naga

At Kitar in Pāṅgī (in the valley of the Chinab), there is a shrine of Dēt Nāg. It is said that human victims were offered to him.[9]

To Earth and River-demons

There is a superstition current throughout India that buried treasure becomes the property of demons, and that it is most hazardous to search for or remove it unless the demons have first been mollified with blood.[10] There are also notions current that 'a bridge over a big or fast-flowing river will not stand until the river-spirit has been appeased by the offering of human blood.[11]

(e). *Offering of one's own blood*

The practice of offering one's own blood to Kālī is in vogue since ancient times. Both the *Kālikā Purāṇa* and later tradition maintain it. Murdoch observes that there is scarcely a respectable house in Bengal the mistress of which has not at

1. *E.R.E.*, VI, p.850.
2. Campbell, *Notes*, 339; Wilson, *Indian Caste*, ii.22sq.; *Bombay Gazetteer*, X, 114.
3. T. Trumpp, *The Ādi Grantha*, *Intro*. p.XC.
4. Ball, *Jungle Life*, p. 580.
5. The Tāmiḷs performed one such sacrifice in 1872; cf. *I. A.* ii, 125.
6. *Ibid.* viii. 219, 220.
7. *Malabar Manual*, Vol. I, p. 356.
8. *Śilappāthikāram*, Canto X ff. Cf. also Kanaka Sabhai, *The Tamils 1800 years Ago*, p. 161.
9. Vogel, *Indian Serpent-lore*, p. 253.
10. *E.R.E.*, VI. p. 852.
11. *Ibid*; cf. also in general, *Human Sacrifices to Water Spirits*, *Q.J.M.S.*, XII, pp. 397ff.

one time or other shed her own blood under the notion of satisfying the Goddess by the operation.[1] The Hibiscus flowers offered to Kālī may be a reminiscence of the above custom.[2] The details of the practice may be summarized as follows: 'When a husband or a son is dangerously ill, a vow is made that on the recovery of the patient the goddess will be propitiated with human blood. The vow is fulfilled either at the next Durgā Pūjā, or at once in some temple of Kālī. The wife or mother, after performing certain ceremonies, draws a few drops of blood from her breast with a nail-cutter, and offers them to the goddess.[3]

(f). *Attribution of Mystic Power*

Crooke observes that there are (also) forms of the rite which depend on the mystic power attributed to human flesh and blood in various charms and black magic.[4] The *Kathāsaritasāgara* narrates some interesting tales in this connection. Once the witches while flying about in the air are described to have said, 'These are the magic powers of witches' spells, and are due to the eating of human flesh. On another occasion, it is related that the hero exchanges an anklet with a woman for some human flesh.'[5]

Bathing in human blood was considered as one of the remedies for disease. Somadēva narrates a story in which the pregnant queen asks her husband to gratify her longing by filling a tank with blood for her to bathe in.[6]

(g). *Killing a King*

The *Golden Bough* narrates many tales of the observance of this practice. A custom of this kind once existed in Calicut, where *Zamorin*, or King, was formerly obliged to cut his throat in public at the end of a twelve years' reign. But by the 17th century the rule had been modified.[7]

(h). *Other Topics*

There are also other interesting topics dealt with in Indian literature e. g. momiai sticks, equivalent to the 'Caduceus of Hermes, the rod of Moses, the staff of Elisha, the wand of circle, or of Gwydion or skirni.' Again, Somadeva describes that a Kāpālika ascetic has a magic stick which dances.

1. Payne, *The Śāktas*, p. 13.
2. Woodroffe, *S.S.*, p. 115.
3. *E.R.E.*, VI, p. 853.
4. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 171.
5. Tawney, *Kathāsaritsāgara*, i. 157, 214.
6. Crooke, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 173-74.
7. *E. R. E.*, p. 853; cf. also, *Pinkerton's Voyages and Travels* (London, 1811), viii. 374.
8. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 178.

PART IV

DIFFUSION OF SAIVISM AND SAIVA SECTS

CHAPTER XIII

DIFFUSION OF SAIVISM

I. EARLY SAIVISM

Various Theories–Mahābhārata Period–Purāṇic Period–The Historical Period.

The period of the origin and development of the Śaiva sects is almost cœval with that of the Vrātya religion itself. It has already been observed how a gradual development of the Vrātya Gods took place from the proto-Indian period, through the Vedic and the post-Vedic period, down to that of the latest of the Purāṇic writings. Even so we can succinctly trace the history of the Śaiva sects during the whole of the above periods.

(a). *Various Theories*

Though all the data at our disposal points to the pre-Vedic origin of the Vrātya religion, still various scholars proposed a post-Vedic origin either to the Vrātya religious belief itself or to its sectarian followers. Hopkins contended that, 'it is to the Epic that one must turn to study the budding and gradual flowering of the modern religions, which have cast strict orthodoxy into the shade.'[1] Barth asserted that, 'Like that of Buddhism, their rise in general was due to the unsatisfactory nature of the old Brahmanical theory, the divinities of which had gradually retired and disappeared behind a host of abstractions too subtle to affect the conscience of the masses. But, in taking this step they did not, like the sect of Śākyamuni, openly sunder all connection with the past.'[2] Winternitz emphatically proposed that, 'in reality all sects of 'Hinduism' which are related to a worship of Viṣṇu or Śiva, are nothing but offshoots of the original Brahmanism, which they never, however, deny'.[3]

However, all that has been discovered at Mohenjo Daro and other sites has proved beyond doubt that the roots of Śaivism can be traced to that very ancient period. The instances of the Yatis in the *Ṛgveda*, the Eka-Vrātya in the *Atharvaveda*, and the Arhats and Gārāgirs in the *Brāhmaṇas*, do point to a non-Vedic origin of the Vrātya sects in general. The Yatis of the *Ṛgveda*, towards whom the Aryans look with a particular contempt, must themselves have been a continuation of the pre-Vedic order of asceticism. In the light of this remark, we find that the rise of the so-called doctrines of Vaiṣṇavism and other systems must have been absolutely of a later origin-at the most starting from the period of the later Upaniṣads and the later portion of the *Mahābhārata*. It should also be noted that the Vrātya religion, which was prevalent in the country during all this period, must have acted as a source of inspiration or stimulus to the other religious sects in India.

1. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, p. 49.
2. Barth, *The Religions of India*, p. 154.
3. Winternitz, 'Die Tantras Und die Religionder Sāktas,' Berlin, in *Ostasiatische Zeit Schrift*, 1916, *Hebt*. 3 ;Trans. in *Śakti and Śākta*, p. 115.

(b). *Early Period*

In the proto-Indian period we found how the early tribes like the Mīnas, Bilavas, Kaṇaṇīrs, Paravas and others were directly connected with the worship of the Divine Triad consisting of Śiva, Ammā and Kārttikeya (Mūruga) respectively. Further, one of the Mohenjo Daro kings introduced the cult of the Liṅga, which was in vogue among the Kāvals, a tribe coming from the far-eastern Islands. Though the Mīna king, who was responsible for introducing it, was imprisoned and perhaps beheaded by the people, still, the cult as such was later on made as their own by the proto-Indians. There were also ascetics residing in caves and meditating on God Śiva.

The *Ṛgveda* always refers to the Yatis, who belonged to the Vrātya order (cf. *infra*). The *Ṛgveda* has twice referred to the Śiśnadēvas and Mūradevas, who were the direct worshippers of the Liṅga and the Divine Triad. Besides, the later Brāhmaṇic and Upaniṣadic literature points out how the various sects like the Gārāgirs, the Arhats, the Kāpālikas and others came into vogue. The *Maitrī Upaniṣad* speaks about the ascetic order in these terms, 'Verily, the source of the net of delusion (Moha) is the fact of the association of one who is worthy of heaven with those who are not. Now, there are those who are continually living upon handi-craft; and, moreover, there are others who are town-beggars, who perform the sacrifice for the unworthy, who are disciples of Śūdras, and who, though Śūdras, know the scriptures. And, moreover, there are others, who are rogues, who wear their hair in a twisted knot.'[1] Side by side with the other sects, we find that the Pāśupatas also come into prominence. The *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* creates for them a fixed order and system.

The *Niddesa*, which is regarded as one of the old books of the Pāli Buddhistic Canon, refers to the various religious systems prevailing in India during the fourth century B. C.: 'The deity of the lay followers of the Ājīvakas is the Ājīvakas, of those of the Nighantas is the Nighantas, of those of the Jaṭilas (ascetics wearing long matted hair) is the Jaṭilas, of those of the Paribbājakas is the Paribbājakas, of those of the Avaruddhakas is the Avaruddhakas, and the deity of those who are devoted to an elephant, a horse, a cow, a dog, a crow, Vasudēva, Baladēva, Puṇṇabhadda, Maṇibhadda, Aggi, Nāgas, Supaṇṇas, Yakkhas, Asuras, Gandhabbas, Mahārājas, Canda, Suriya, India, Brahma, Dava, Disa, is the elephant, the horse, the cow, the dog, the crow, Vasudēva, Baladēva, Puṇṇabhadda, Maṇibhadda, etc. respectively.''[2]

(c). *Śaiva sects and devotees in Mahābhārata*

The *Mahābhārata* gives some important details in regard to the devotees of Śiva. Arjuna, on the advice of Kṛṣṇa, is described to have made an obeisance to Durgā before the commencement of the battle, and prayed for success.[3] The *Anuśāsana Parva* relates the story of the fight which ensued between Śiva in the guise of a Kirāta and Arjuna, and how afterwards Śiva being pleased with him, gifted away the Pāśupata weapon to him.[4] In the *Droṇa*

Saiva Devotees

1. *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, VII.8.
2. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (Collected Works, Vol. IV), pp. 3–4.
3. Cf. Page 101 *Supra*.
4. *Vana Parvan*, Adhs. 38–40.

Parva, Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna are said to have visited the Kailāsa mountain; and that on that Arjuna obtained the Pāśupatāstra from Śiva.[1] *The Sauptika Parva* narrates how Aśvatthāman propitiated Śaṅkara and obtained a sword from him; and how on Śiva himself entering into his body, Aśvatthāman carried on havoc and destruction with the terrible sword in the camp of the Pāṇḍavas, killing all their progeny and even Dhṛṣṭadyumna, who had cut off the head of his father Droṇa.[2] The *Anuśāsana Parva* relates another interesting story of Kṛṣṇa: Jāmbavatī, one of the wives of Kṛṣṇa, expressed the desire of having as good a son as that of Rukmiṇī, his chief consort. Eventually, Kṛṣṇa had to take recourse to Mahādēva, through whose favour alone his wishes could be fulfilled. He then went to the Himālayas, the abode of Śiva. On the way he saw the hermitage of Upamanyu,[3] and had a long discourse with him.[4] The text also gives a long list of worshippers, including the Daityas, who attained their desired objects, such as 'sons, weapons, powers, etc. through the favour of Mahādēva, whom they had propitiated by rigid austere practices and other ways.' It is worth noting that Upamanyu himself is described as a Liṅga worshipper.

The *Mahābhārata* details the stories of Śukra and Paraśurāma. Again Śiva is said to have been born as Durvāsa.[5] Jayadratha is said to have constructed the Vyūha with the help of the boon from Rudra.[6] The story of Bhagīratha is related in the *Vanaparva*. Drupada is described to have begot Śikhaṇḍī, mainly through the blessings of Śiva.[7] Śikhaṇḍī himself was a worshipper of Śiva.[8] Jarāsandha was a worshipper of Śiva Paśupati.[9] The *Mahābhārata* relates how he had imprisoned one hundred kings with the intention of sacrificing them as victims in the temple of Paśupati at Vāraṇāvata (cf. under *Human Sacrifice*). The stories of Mārkaṇḍeya[10] and Maṅkaṇaka[11] are detailed in the *Vana* and *Śalya Parvas* respectively.

Sects in Mahabharata

The *Mahābhārata* makes a mention of the Pāśupata sect and deals with its theology. Again, the Epic commentator sees in the epithet *Pañcamahākalpa*, applied to Viṣṇu, a reference to the scriptures, *Āgamas* of diverse sects, Sauras, Śāktas, Gāṇeśas, Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇavas.[12] Winternitz and Hopkins, however, do not agree with the above interpretation. Still, the fact that the *Mahābhārata* knew a number of sects and their systems becomes clear from one of its passages wherein a clear reference is made to the Aumas (Umā worshippers), Māhēśvaras, Nandi-dharmas, Kaumāras, etc.[13] Further, it refers to the sects, when it states that, the red garment, 'the vow of silence, the three-fold staff, the water-pot, these only lead astray; they do not make for salvation.'[14]

1. *Droṇa P.*, Adhs. 80–81.
2. *Sauptika P.*, Adh. 7.
3. *Anuśāsana P.*, Adh. 14.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Anuśāsana P.*, Adh. 265; cf. also *Viṣṇu P. Aṁśa* I.9.1.
6. *Droṇa P.*, Adh. 43.
7. *Udyoga P.*, 189.
8. *Ibid.*, 193,54.
9. *Sabhā P.*, Adh. 14, 74–75.
10. *Vana P.*, Adh. 130.
11. *Śalya P.*, Adh 39, 64 ff.
12. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p.118.
13. *Āśvamēdhika P.*, Adh. 96, 17 ff.
14. *Śānti P.*, Adh. 330, 29.

(d). *The Purāṇic Data*

The Purāṇas are a repository of the cultural lore of the proto- and ancient Indians. The Purāṇic writers have accumulated data which was in the form of floating traditions handed down from one generation to the other since almost the early beginnings of Indian history. First, they depict the deeds of the various devotees of Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā and other Gods; then they speak of the various sects and their cults; and thirdly, they describe how a particular struggle was going on between the orthodox and the so-called heterodox communities in ancient India. It is proposed to deal here with the broader aspects of the Vrātya religion, as they are dealt with in the Purāṇas.

(1) *The Priest-hood and the Sects.*

Whatever may be the age of the respective Purāṇas in general, we find that all these documents depict the particular conflict that was going on between the followers of the Vedic and the non-Vedic section of the people. By the end of the Gṛhyasūtra period, almost all the rites and customs of the Aryans had taken a definite shape and form. And during the next few centuries, the Smṛtis laid down social and religious rules and regulations for the observance by the people in the Aryanized India. Eventually, we find that the Purāṇic writers of the age describe the so-called heretical sects rather in a term of denunciation.

The Purāṇas describe rather with a peculiar sense of aghast of what would happen at the advent of the Kaliyuga. While speaking of the predominance of the Śūdras in the political sphere, and the break-down of the Varṇāśrama-dharma, they emphatically state that, "Thus even the best of Brāhmans fare against the directions of the Vedas, turn non-believers, and sell the fruit of their penance and sacrifices. The Brāhmans became spiritually connected with the Śūdras who claimed equality of status as regards bed, seat and dining. In religion also the Śūdras exhibited abnormal zeal. Naturally the Śūdras had a special attraction for Buddhism, because it denounced caste system and challenged the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇas. They were further encouraged by the acceptance of Buddhism and Jainism by the kings, became Buddhist monks, and began to preach Buddhism. The *Vāyu*[1] and the *Brahmāṇḍa*[2] *Purāṇas* observe: 'With white teeth, eyes brought under control, heads shaved and red clothes on, the Śūdras will perform religious deeds'. Besides the above causes of disturbance, there were also others which seemed to destroy social peace and order. Kings turned robbers, and the officers lost all sympathy for their masters. There was a great spread of Śaivism with the result that in the country buildings and squares were marked with tridents, and women used these to tie their hair. Some people put on red clothes, some became Nirgranthas, some turned Kāpālikas, some sold the Vedas, and some sold the Tīrthas...' Further it is described that there will be various sects; Sannyāsins wearing clothes coloured red, Kāpālikas and various others holding themselves followers of some Deva or other, will find fault with Dharma; that, many shall profess to have supreme knowledge, because

1. *Vāyu*, 58, 59.
2. *Brahmāṇḍa P.* II, 31, 59¾(b), 60 (a).
3. *Kūrma*, I. 29, 12; *Bṛhad-dharma*, II. 31, 65, which describes as 'S'iva-śūlā dvijāstathā'.

thereby they will easily earn their livelihood, that some hypocrites will mark their bodies with Vedic symbols also, and that, in the Kali age anybody will study the Vedas; and the Śūdras will be experienced in the Veda, and that there will be many false religionists".[1] The *Devībhāgavata* speaks of the prevalence of those who brand themselves with the marks (hot), those who are given to obscene (*kāmācāra-ratāḥ*) acts, Kāpālikas, Kaulikas, Bauddhas, Jains and others, who are all doers of evil actions.'[2] The *Nāradīya Purāṇa* relates about the heretics without religion, the vilest beggars, the Kāpālikas, and those who wander naked or with red clothes.[3]

(2) *The Various Sects and Systems.*

The Purāṇas give a description of the various Vrātya sects and systems of philosophy. They also express their own denunciation regarding those systems every now and then. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* states that the six Darśanas were: Brāhma, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Saura, Śākta, and Ārhata.[4] The *Kūrma P.*, a Śaiva document *par excellence*, says that God Keśava created the following Śāstras, by way of causing delusion (Moha-śāstras), at the initiation of Śiva: Kāpāla, Nākula, Vāma, Bhairava (*Pūrva and Paścima*), Pāñcarātra, Pāśupata and other thousands of Śāstras[5]. Again, it refers to the Kāpāla, Bhairava, Yāmala, Vāma, Ārhata and others.[6] In another passage it makes a distinction between the Śrauta and Aśrauta systems: 'By me was first composed, for the attainment of liberation, Śrauta Pāśupata, which is excellent, subtle and secret, the essence of Vedas. The learned who are devoted to the Veda should meditate on Śiva Paśupati. This is Pāśupata Yoga to be practised by seekers of liberation. By me also have been spoken Pāśupata, Soma, Lākula and Bhairava opposed to Veda. They should not be practised. They are outside Veda.'[7] The *Skānda Purāṇa* refers to the twenty-eight Āgamas, and says, that the following five lead to the path of liberation: Kālamukha (or Kāḷāmukha), Kaṅkāla, Śaiva, Pāśupata and Mahāvrata.[8] In another place, it mentions the Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Bhūtanetra, Gāruda, Bhairava, Mahātantra, Kūlamārga (which is two-fold).[9] The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* describes that, 'the God of the Āgamas is Śiva, Śāradā of the Tantras, Gaṇapati of Jāmalas, Nārāyaṇa of Bhārata, etc.[10] *The Nāradīya Purāṇa* makes a classification of the Śaivas as: 'those who are Siddhānta-mārgīs, Pāśupatas, Mahāvratadharas, and Kāpālikas.'[11] The *Śiva P.* makes a distinction between Śrauta and Aśrauta (Vedic and non-Vedic) kinds of Āgamas. It says, 'Śaivas are those who are engrossed in the performance of the sacrifice of knowledge, and the Maheśvaras are those who are in the performance of rites.'[12] The *Vāmana Purāṇa* refers to the four systems, namely, Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kāladamana and Kāpālika. It also refers to the name of Ṛtudhvaja Sāmavedī, who is a Pāśupatācārya.[13]

1. Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 209-10 (for the whole topic).
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Nāradīya P.; Pūrvabhāga*, 80, 56-8.
4. *Vāyu P.*, 104, 16.
5. *Kūrma P., Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 38, p. 740 (Bengali Ed.).
6. *Ibid*, 12, 137.
7. *Kūrma*, XVI. 1.
8. *Skānda, P, Aruṇācala-Mā.* 10,65.
9. *Ibid, Prabhāsa-Kh.*, 1,24,26.
10. *Bhaviṣya P.*, 2,116,8-9.
11. *Nāradīya P. Uttara-Kh.*, 31,103.
12. *Śiva P., Pūrva Kh.*, 32,11.
13. *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 63, 70.

The *Vāyavīya Saṁhitā* of the *Śiva Purāṇa* deals with the whole of the Āgamic system. Besides, there are other references made in the various Purāṇas regarding one aspect of Śaivism or the other e. g. *Saura P.* (Adh. 38–40); *Padma P.* (*Bhūmi-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 1 ff.); *Liṅga P.* (Adh. 15 ff.); *Brahmāṇḍa P.* (*Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 3 and 34); *Varāha P.* (Adh. 21, 79), etc.

(3) *Early Devotees.*

The Purāṇas have supplied us with ample materials in regard to the early devotees of Śiva. However, the statements made by them should be treated with caution. Sometimes they may be sheer inventions, and sometimes they may be real facts. It is proposed here to give a brief survey of the main Śaiva devotees who flourished in the past.

The Purāṇas mention the following names of kings and queens who were the devotees of Śiva: The Prācīna-barhiṣas,[1] Rāghava (who installed the Liṅga at Rāmeśvaram),[2] Bhagīratha (who brought down the Ganges by praising Śiva),[3] Saudāsa,[4] the sons of Kārttavīrya,[5] the sixteen kings: Pṛthu, Marut, Bharata, Śaśabindu, Gaya, Śibi, Rāma, Ambarīṣa, Māndhāta, Dilīpa, Bhagīratha, Suhotra, Rantideva, Yayāti, Sagara,[6] the Kekaya king Dharmasakhā,[7] Kṛṣṇa, Bhīṣmaka, King of Vṛṣṇis,[8] Janaka,[9] Aila,[10] Ikṣvāku,[11] Sagara's second wife (who obtained a boon for children), Arjuna[12] (who obtained the Pāśupatāstra etc.), Śukra, Paraśurāma, Nābhāga,[13] Priyavrata and his sons, Uttānapāda and his descendants, Dhruva, Ṛṣabha, Bharata, Kakustha, and others.[14]

The following sages are described as being the devotees of Śiva: Yājñavalkya and others,[15] Gālava,[16] Śvetāśvatara (called a Mahā-Pāśupata),[17] Dadhīci,[18] his son Pippalāda[19] (who is called an incarnation of Śiva), Bhṛgu, Śukra (who obtained the Sañjivanī-Vidyā), Śāṇḍilya[20], Māṇṭi, Gautama (with his Kṣetra at Aruṇācala)[21], Mārkaṇḍeya,[22] Durvāsa (called an incarnation of Śiva),[23] Māṇḍavya,[24] Jābāla,[25] Hārītamuni,[26] Vyāsa,[27] and others. Almost all these devotees are introduced either in connection with enhancing the importance of a particular centre of pilgrimage, or a particular act or observance of the *Vrata* in regard to the worship of a deity.

---

1. *Bhāgavata P.* IV. Adh. 30, 1.
2. *Śiva P. Uttarākoṭi-Saṁhitā*, Adh. 31, 14.
3. *Bhaviṣya P.* 3, 1, 42.
4. *Bṛhad-dharma, Pūrva-khaṇḍa*, Adh. 49 and others.
5. *Saura P.* 31, 1.
6. *Skānda P. Prabhāsa-Mā.* Adh. 220, 4 ff.
7. *Ibid, Brahmakhaṇḍa, Setu-Mā.*, 15. 7 ff.
8. *Bhāgavata P.* 10, 53, 25.
9. *Brahmavaivarta, Brahmakhaṇḍa*, Adh. 6.
10. *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, Adh 66, 56.
11. *Ibid*, Adh. 104.
12. *Śiva P. Uttarā-Śatarudra-Saṁhitā*, Adh. 3.
13. *Ibid*, 3, 29.
14. *Ibid*, 22, 37 ff.
15. *Skānda P. Prabhāsa-Kh.*, 1. Adh. 5, 13 ff.
16. *Vāmana P.* 65, 8.
17. *Kūrma, Uttarabhāga*, Adh. 12.
18. *Skānda P. Kedāra-Khaṇḍa*, Adh. 6, 90.
19. *Ibid*, Adh 16, 90.
20. *Skānda, Kaumāra-Kh.*, Adh, 2.
21. *Ibid, Aruṇācala-Mā. Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 4.
22. *Ibid, Vaiṣṇava-Khaṇḍa, Puruṣottamakṣetra-Mā.*, Adh. 30, 10 ff.
23. *Ibid, Vaiṣṇava-Khaṇḍa, Bhāgavata-Mā.*, Adh. 8.
24. *Ibid*, 5, 3, Adh. 169, 36.
25. *Śiva P. Vidyeśvara Saṁ.*, Adh. 12, 21.
26. *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 46, 30.
27. *Śiva P.*, 3. Adh. 37, 22 ff.

II. LATER SPREAD OF SAIVISM

Immediately after the writing of the *Śvetāśvātara* and *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣads*, the first historical reference to Śaivism is made by Megasthenes. He states that, 'the worship of Dionysos preceded that of Herakles by fifteen generations. There were Dionysiac festivals in honour of the latter God Śiva who belongs to where flourishes the wine, in the Aśvaka District, situated to the north of the Kabul river.'[1] This must have been situated, in our opinion, somewhere in the province of Bactria, which was one of the centres of the Vrātya religion since ancient times. Bactria or Bālhīka was known for its excellent breed of horses. Hence the name 'Aśvaka' was probably invented to indicate the same.

Kauṭilya refers to Skanda in his famous work *Arthaśāstra* (cf. under *Kārttikeya*). The Pāśupata sect seems to have existed even during the time of Aśoka, who visited Nepal about 249 B.C., and accompanied by his daughter Cārumatī, who had adopted a religious life and settled herself in a convent built in honour of Paśupatināth, about two miles away to the north of Kāṭhamāṇḍu.[2] But, when Aśoka became a champion of Buddhism, he seems to have given a shocking blow to the followers of the other sects in India. In one of his edicts he says, 'the gods, who were worshipped as true divinities in India, have been rendered false by my zeal'.

A great variety of deities appears on Kaniṣka's coins, amongst which are the two and four-armed types, the Sun and Moon, Skanda and Viśākha, a Fire-God and Wind-God, running. An early Kushāṇa seal of fine quality also bears the figure of a two-armed Śiva. The Kushāṇa King Kadphises II had the representation of the God stamped on his coins[3]. Wema Kadphises styles himself on the reverse of his coins as a devotee of Mahēśvara; and an image of Nandī and another of Śiva with a trident in his hand occur on the obverse. Patañjalī in his *Mahābhāṣya* refers to the Śivabhāgavatas, and states that they carry an iron lance as an emblem of the deity they worshipped[4]. The Mathura sculptures belonging to the second or third centuries A.D. give some interesting details. 'A Śiva Liṅga with a figure of Śiva, analogous to the older Guḍimallam figure but four-armed, is certainly a Mathura work. Again, as Coomaraswamy points out, 'the fact is so curious as to be worth mentioning that an image of Ardhanārīśvara is unmistakably described by a Greek author Strabaeus (*fl. ca.* 500 A.D.), quoting Bardasenes, who reports the account of an Indian who visited Syria in the time of Antoninus of the Emesa, i.e. Elegabalus, who reigned between 218-228 A. D.'[5] The early Arjunāyanas and Yaudheyas (3rd or 4th cen. B.C.) were keen devotees of Śiva.[6] The names assumed by the Bhāraśiva Nāgas e.g. Vīrasena, Skanda Nāga, Bhīma Nāga, Deva Nāga, prove that sense of Śaiva responsibility and necessity which the time required.[7]

1. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, pp. 458-59. 2. Smith, *E.H.I.*, p. 185.
3. *Ibid*, p. 318; *Cunningham, Coins of the Indo-Scythians*, III, p. 8.
4. *Patañjalī* on *Pāṇini*, V.2.76. 5. Coomaraswamy, *H.I.I.A.*, p.67.
6. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*. p, 196, ff.
7. Jayaswal, *History of India* ... pp. 49-50.

The Guptas gave a new impetus to Śaivism. Their very names like Skanda and Kumāra, point out the particular reverence they showed towards God Kārttikēya. One of the Udayagiri Cave inscriptions is engraved on a panel, over the figures of Viṣṇu and Dvādaśabhujā Caṇḍī. Another Udayagiri inscription records the dedication of a cave to Śambhu. The Bilsad inscription of Kumāragupta I refers to the construction of Pratoli in the temple of Svāmī Mahāsena, thus representing another form of Hindu worship. It is also worth noting that the Mathura pillar inscription of Candragupta II Vikramāditya records that, in A. D. 380 Uditācārya installed the image of his *Guru* and *Guru's Guru*, Kapila and Upamita respectively, in the *Gurvyāyatana*. Uditācārya is said to have been the tenth Guru after Kuśika, the direct disciple of Lakulīśa.[1] This inscription also throws light on the early beginning of the Lakulīśa cult.

Haribhadra, an old Jain author, describes, in his Ṣaḍdarśana-samuccaya, the schools of Gotama and Kaṇāda as professing the Śaiva faith. His commentator, Guṇaratna (4th cen. A. D.), however, calls the Vaiśeṣikas as Pāśupatas and the other school as Śaivas.[2]

The *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the Jain works relate some important stories in regard to the Vrātya ascetics. The story of Agada-datta gives a graphic description of a robber-chief who operates in the make up of a Pāśupata ascetic.[3] In Devendra's *Mahārāṣṭrī* Tales is related the story of a Pāśupata ascetic. He is really a highway robber, and is adorned with diadems of long, matted hair; his limbs are strewn with ashes; in his fist he holds the trident; he is encircled with evil-averting amulets; and his fingers are busy with his hermit's token.[4] The *Kathāsaritsāgara* narrates a story of a wicked Mahāvratin ascetic named Jālapada, who is muttering spell in a corner of an empty temple (26. 196).[5]

Varāhamihira, in his famous work *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, refers to the religious sects which were in vogue in his times. He states that, 'the images of Viṣṇu, Sūrya, Śambhu (Śiva), Mātṛgaṇas, Brahmā, Buddha and the Jinas, should be duly consecrated and installed by the Bhāgavatas, the Magas, the ash-besmeared twice-born ones (i.e. Pāśupatas), those well-acquainted with the worship of the Mātṛgaṇas, the Brāhmans versed in the Vedic lore, the Śākyas and the unclad ones respectively, according to the rites particular to the worship of the individual gods.'[6] Harṣa was a devotee of all the three gods Śiva, Sun and Buddha. One of his ancestors named Puṣyabhūti was also a devotee of Śiva. Harṣa's court-poet Bāṇa describes the Śaiva ascetics who were dressed in red and their bodies being smeared with ashes. They were 'among those who waited to see Tārāpīḍa's minister Śukanāsa at the door of his house for some private purposes of their own'. He also 'represents Vilāsavatī, the queen of Tārāpīḍa, to have gone to the temple of Mahākāla on the fourteenth (of the dark-half of the

1. *E. I.* XXI, pp. 1–9; Nilakanta Sastri, 'Historical Sketch of Saivism,' *The Cultura Heritage of India*, II, pp. 26-27.

2. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (Collected Works, Vol. IV), p. 167.

3. Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, XLIV, p. 231. 4. *Ibid*, p. 232. 5. *Ibid*, p. 217.

6. *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, Ch. 59,19; Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, p. 249.

month) to worship the God.' In the *Mālatī-Mādhava* of the famous poet-dramatist Bhavabhūti, Mālatī is represented as having gone with her mother to the temple of Śaṅkara on the fourteenth of the dark-half of the month.[1]

The Pāśupatas are often referred to by the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang (7th cen. A. D.). He refers to the Pāśupatas twelve times, and mentions that there were temples of Mahēśvara at which the Pāśupatas worshipped and resided (in some). He describes that, 'at Benares there were about ten thousand sectaries who honoured Mahēśvara, besmeared their bodies with ashes, went naked and tied their hair in knots. Poets like Kālidāsa, Subandhu, Bāṇa, Śrī Harṣa, Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, Bhavabhūti and others always invoke Śiva's benediction at the beginning of their works. Further Pāṇini is described to have received from Śiva the revelation of his grammar.[2] The first fourteen *Sūtras* of Pāṇini, supposed to have been revealed, are for that reason called *Śivasūtras*. Kumārilabhaṭṭa was a great champion of Śaivism. The great logical acrobat Śaṅkarācārya also is said to have been a Śākta devotee.[3]

The kings of the Bhañja or Mayūra Dynasty (9th cen. onwards) had the bull as their Lāñcchana. The Bamanghati plate of Raṇabhañja II of *Saṁvat* 288, displays in a circle with rim of lotus petals, crescent, bull and trident above legend in one line, below, fully blossomed lotus.[4] He says in all piety that he 'expelled his sin by the worship of the feet of Śiva.'[5] The family patroness of the Bhañjas seems to have been the goddess Stambēśvarī, whose cult was wide-spread in Orissa.[6] The Candelas of Bundelkhand (9th cen. onwards) were the keen devotees of Śiva and Bhavānī. The Kālañjar lithic inscription contains a hymn of praise to Purāri[7] (Śiva). Like the Khadgas, the *couchant* bull formed the symbol of the Candra dynasty (A.D. 788-994).[8] Their coins have the 'couchant bull' on the obverse and the 'trident' on the reverse, a fact which clearly shows that the ancient religion of the Buddhists was suspended and replaced by Śaivite objects. Further, the Comilla inscription, which is on the pedestal of Narttēśvara icon, contains the name of Śrī Layahacandra, who is the same as the last king Tsu-la-taing-tsan-dra of the Candra dynasty. The Chauhāns or Chāhamānas of Śākambharī (8th cen. to 1193 A.D.) had the bull as their Lāñcchana. The Billion and silver coins of Someśvara and Pṛthvirāja have on the two sides, the horseman with lance to right and Śrī Someśvaradeva and recumbent hump-bull and *Aśavarī Śrī Samantadeva*.[9] Harṣadeva seems to have been their family deity. The Guhiloṭs were devotees of Ēkaliṅga. The following temples were built in the Kaṭak District of Orissa: Paraśurāmēśvara (ca. 750); Muktēśvara (950); Liṅgarāja (1000); Rājrām, and Jagannātha at Purī (ca. 1150); Mēghēśvara (ca. 1200); Konarak Sun Temple and Liṅgarāja Nāṭya Maṇḍapa (13th cen. A. D.).

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
2. *Kathāsaritsāgara*, i. 4; *Bṛhatkathā*, in *I. A.*, I. 304.
3. Cf. Page 104 *Supra*.
4. *J.A.S.B.*, 1871, p. 165.
5. *J.B.&O.R.S.*, IV, 172.
6. *E.I.*, XII, p. 326.
7. *I. A.*, XXV, p. 206; *J.A.S.B.*, XVII, p. 313, 316; *I.A.*, XIX, p. 354. No. 152.
8. *Proc.* of *A.S.B.*, 1885, pp. 49-52, pl. II.
9. Cunningham, *C.M.I.*, p. 83, pl. IX-XIV.

Andhra Period

Śaivism attained a certain popularity during the Āndhra period. As Professor Dr. Gopalachari points out, 'Names like Śivapālita, Śivakhadila, Śivadatta, Kumāra, etc. point to a worship of Śiva and Skanda. The *Sapta-Śatakam* furnishes us interesting data in this direction. In the opening and closing verses Paśupati and Gaurī are adored. Temples of Gaurī are mentioned in Gāthā 172. Śiva is also called Paramatādhipa in Gāthā 440. Kāpālinīs or ash-covered and skull-bearing women ascetics are also mentioned (Gāthā 408). Gaṇeśa is mentioned as Gaṇādhipati (Gāthā 403,372).'[1]

The Banas

Astounding things are narrated of Bali and Bāṇa, who is said to have appointed Śiva as a guardian of the gates and door-keeper of his capital.[2] The Lāñcchana of the Bāṇas consisted of a bull. The Mudayur plates of Malladēva invoke Śiva in the beginning. The Guḍimallam grant of Vikramāditya III contains laudatory verses addressed to Śiva. It was given away to Brāhmans because he received a boon from Paraśurāmēśvara. In the opening verses of the Udayendiram plates there is an eulogy of Śiva and Nārāyaṇa.[3]

Karnataka

In Karnāṭaka, the Kaṇaṇirs of the Mohenjo Daro times seem to have been the earliest worshippers of Śiva. The Mīnas and later the Nāgas had settled themselves down in this province. In the historical period, as the Tālguṇḍa inscription emphatically points out, 'at the Śiva temple at Sthānakundūr (Tālguṇḍa), which was rebuilt by Kakusthavarmmā of the Kadamba family, Śātakarṇi and other kings had formerly worshipped'.[4] The Kadambas themselves derived their descent from the three-eyed and four-armed Kadamba, who is said to have sprung into being from a drop of sweat that fell to the ground from the broad forehead of Śiva under a Kadamba tree.[5] According to another version King Mayūravarmmā was born to Rudra and the Earth under the auspicious Kadamba tree.[6] Śaivism thrived side by side with the other religious systems like Vaiṣṇavism, Jainism and others during the regime of the Cālukyas. The *Vikramāṅkadeva-Carita* introduces Śiva thrice to instruct the hero. It is interesting to observe that the names of the Cālukya kings and queens are introduced in the case of Śiva temples *e.g.* Jagadekamalleśvara, Mallikāmōdeśvara, Akkeśvara, Someśvara and others. Further, 'out of the thirteen inscriptions found at Puli, five are S'aivas, three are Vaiṣṇavas, two Jains, one belonging to the cult of Harihara, while the rest two are non-sectarian hero-stones'.[7] The various inscriptions describe 'the Cālukyas as meditating at the feet of Kārttikeya, as being protected by the seven mothers'. The establishment of the three gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara was made by King Vijayāditya. There is again an image of Harihara in the cave temple at Bādāmi. It was during the regime of Vijayāditya and his son Vikramāditya II that the famous temples of Saṅgameśvara, Vijayeśvara and Virūpākṣa were built. Further the Rāṣṭrakūṭa

1. Gopalachari, *Early History of the Andhra Country*, p. 123.
2. *E. C.* X, Mb., 157.
3. Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 17.
4. *E. C. VII*, Sk. 176.
5. Moraes, *The Kadambakula*, p. 7; *E. C.* VII, Sk. 117.
6. *E. C.* XI, Dg. 35.
7. *E. I.* XVIII, p. 170.

King Kṛṣṇa II built the most exquisite shrine of Kailāsanātha at Ellorā. The Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras like the Sindas, Guttas, Pāṇḍyas and the Raṭṭas were the worshippers of Śiva. In connection with the origin of the Sindas a story is related: 'from the union in love of Śiva and Sindhu was born 'a son who eventually came to fame as the 'long-armed' Sinda, the founder of the dynasty.'[1] King Permaḍideva I of the Yelburgā house is said to have won the favour of God Śrīkaṇṭhadeva.[2] The Guttas had as their family God Śiva under the name of Mahākāla of Ujjayini.[3] The most wonderful efforts towards the propagation of Śaivism were made by Basava, the founder of the Vīraśaiva creed, and the Kāḷāmukhas. Śaivism thrived even during the period of the Hoysaḷas.

Saivism in Tamil Land

A very interesting account is given by Prof. Nilakanta Sastri in regard to the development of Śaivism in the Tāmiḷ country since very early times. In fact we are now in a position to succinctly trace the history of Śaivism since the Śaṅgama period. During the Śaṅgama period, the Tāmiḷs worshipped the various gods e. g. 'Māyon' or Kṛṣṇa, 'Śeyon' or the Red God Subrahmaṇya, 'Vendan' or Indra, and Varuṇa.[4] The Śaṅgama literature further refers to the building of the temples or Koṭṭams. People then used to perform sacrifices. The *Puṛam* refers to the destruction of the three castles, the blue neck, the moon on the head and the eye on the forehead of Śiva.[5] Śiva was called Kuṛṛam, and a reference is made to his long braid shining like a flame, a flag having the strong bull for his ensign and a blue neck.[6] The name of Śiva as Mudumudalvan occurs in the *Puṛa Nānuṛu*.[7] The author of the *Puṛam* compares King Ilavandigai-ppaḷḷittuñjiya Nanmāṛan to Śiva, Balarāma, Viṣṇu and Subrahmaṇya.[8] The *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimekalai* show the popularity of Śaivism during those days. It is stated that Śeṅguṭṭuvan worshipped both Śiva and Viṣṇu, and that he was wearing Śiva's feet on his head and had put on Viṣṇu's garland round his neck.[9] A new impetus, however, was given to Śaivism at the hands of the Śaiva Nāyanārs (or Nāyaṇmārs) whose lives are first dealt with in *Tiruttoṇḍattogai* and then in the *Peṛiyapurāṇam* in detail. We are dealing with the working of the Nāyanārs in detail in the portion on philosophy. Suffice it to say here, in the words of Nilakanta Sastri, that 'the emotional theism of these masters (Nāyanārs and Āḷvars) of popular song, 'running in the parallel channels of Viṣṇuism and Śaivism, is in many ways the most characteristic product of Tāmiḷ religious experience. The great work done by these holy men who traversed the whole of the Tāmiḷ land several times over singing, preaching, organising, has ever since been treasured by a grateful posterity in beautiful legends which are significant even in their anachronisms'.[10] Their greatest contribution was their Siddhānta philosophy. Though we find a marked hatred shown against Jainism and Buddhism, there was no jealousy between the two creeds of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism. The legend of the

1. *E. C.* VII, H. 50.
2. Fleet, *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, XI, p. 236.
3. Fleet, *P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions*, No. 108.
4. *Tolkāppiyam*, *Por.* 5.
5. *Puṛam*, 55.
6. C. V. N. Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 110.
7. *Puṛam*, 166.
8. *Ibid*, 56.
9. *Śilappadikāram*, Cantos. 26,11. 54–67.
10. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Coḷas*, p. 473.

meeting of Sambandar and Tirumangāi is perhaps 'the expression of the wistful memory of happier times'. 'Under the Coḷas of the line of Vijayālaya may be said to commence the silver age of South Indian Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism.'

Very soon afterwards the practice of the recitation of hymns came into vogue. During the reign of King Parāntaka and Rājarāja a new impetus was given to this practice both by way of donation and State sympathies. In the reign of Rājarāja I, there seems to have been a regular State Department under Devārnāyakam, or Superintendent of Devāram, to look after the work. Besides, various temples were built during the period. The Kailāsanātha temple at Kāñchīpuram and the Shore temple at Mahābalipuram are instances to the point. Various temples were built during the reign of Āditya I and Parāntaka I. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Kṛṣṇa III is said to have erected several temples in the land newly conquered by him, one of them being the Kālapriya at Kāvēripākkam.[1] Even Śembiyan-Mahādēvī is said to have used all her influence and resources throughout her son's reign and far into that of his successor Rājarāja I for the construction and the very liberal endowment of an unusually large number of temples.[2] It is worth noting, however, that Rajēndra I is said to have brought the Āgamānta Brahmans into his country. With the persecution of Rāmānuja, however, begins an era of a great conflict between the two creeds of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism respectively. Various inscriptions describe how endowments were made for the feeding of the S'ivayōgis and others. The following images were generally worshipped: 'Besides images of S'iva in his various aspects like Kirātārjunīya, Bhikṣāṭana, Kalyāṇasundara, Pañcadeha-Liṅga-purāṇadeva, Umāsahita, Naṭarāja, Dakṣiṇāmūrti, S'rīkaṇṭha and so on, the icons presented to the great temple at Tanjore by its royal patrons included images of Gaṇapati, Subrahmaṇya, Mahāviṣṇu and Sūrya. There were also images of Śaiva saints receiving regular worship among them like Caṇḍēśvara, the three authors of the Dēvāram, Meypporuḷ-nāyanār, S'iruttoṇḍar, S'irūḷar and others. Among goddesses are mentioned Kāla-piḍāri, Durgā-Paramēśvarī, and Emālattu Durgaiyar Oṁkārasundarī, and forms of Piḍāri, Śeṭṭaiyar (Jyeṣṭhā) and others, who (of the latter) shrines are called *Timmurram* as distinguished from the *Śrī Koyil* of the higher pantheon'.[3]

The Pallavas and other Dynasties

The Viṣṇukuṇḍins were the worshippers of the God at Śrī-Parvata, which is identified with the worship of Kālī.[4] S'aivism also prospered in the dominion of the Pallavas. The *Tēvāram* and the *Mattavilāsa–Prahasana* throw light on the various aspects of the activities of the Kāpālikas, the Kālāmukhas and the Pāśupatas respectively. It has been pointed out that, 'in the lower cave of the rock-fort at Trichinopoly there is a sculpture of Durgā and a devotee offering his head—a fact which shows that Śaivism flourished in this part of the Pallava dominions. A definite predominance was given to the goddess Durgā (especially in her aspects of Mahiṣāsuramarddinī) at Māmalla-puram. Especially the images of Bhairava and Brahma-śiraś chēdana in the Kailāsa-nātha temple at Kañchī are of absorbing interest. There are some very fine representations depicting the various scenes of head-offering to the goddess Kālī.

1. *E. I.* IV, p. 281, and 382 of 1905. 2. Nilakanta Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 483.
3. Nilakanta Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 490.
4. *E.I.* IV, p.191 ff. Cf. for the following information, Minakshi, *The Pallavas*, pp. 179ff.

The Kaṅguvīras are described to have cut off their heads and tongues as offerings to the god residing at S'rī-S'ailam. Śāntaliṅga, a Vīraśaiva and an officer of Kṛṣṇadevarāya, cut off the heads of all the Śvetāmbara Jains living in the neighbourhood of S'rī-S'ailam as a sacrifice to S'iva residing on the same hill.[1]

The traces of the early spread of S'aivism can be found in the Eastern Archipelago and the Hinduised States of Farther India. When Fa Hian visited the Island of Java, the Pāśupatas had already established themselves there.[2] The temples of S'iva at Prambanam and Panataran show how S'aivism developed there during the later centuries. As Nilakanta Sastri has pointed out, 'the early Hindu kingdom of Champā on the east coast of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula was ruled by a line of kings who were clearly of S'aiva persuasion; witness the construction of the shrine of Bhadrēśvara of about 400 A. D., called after Bhadravarman, an early ruler of Campā. There was also a Bhagavatī temple at Po Nagar which took the place of a more ancient Mukhaliṅga shrine (8th century A. D. ?)...In Fu-Nan, the predecessor of Kāmbhōja, were worshipped in the fifth century images of gods 'with two faces and four arms, four faces and eight arms, each arm holding something or other–a child, a bird, sun or moon, a description which recalls Skanda in the Somaskanda group, the parrot of Durgā, and the antelope of Śiva, as well as his moon.'[3] During the later times one finds the gradual development of the Śaiva religion. The cult of Harihara, the Liṅga and other minor gods also came into vogue.

1. *Madras Ep. Rep.*, 1915, p. 93.
2. Krom, *Hindœ Javansche Geschiedenis*, p. 82.
3. Nilakanta Sastri, cf. *Cultural Heritage of India*, II, p. 29.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SAIVA SECTS

Yatis—Arhats—Gārāgirs—Pāśupatas—Lakulīśa Pāśupatas—Kāpālikas—Kālāmukhas—Gorakhanāthis—Rasēśvaras—Some Minor Sects.

Introductory

In the foregoing Chapter we have seen how the early beginnings of the Vrātya sects can be traced to the pre-Ṛgvedic period. Since then the Yatis, the Gārāgirs, the Pāśupatas, the Kāpālikas and other sects, began to come into prominence. As in the case of every other nation, the various sects in ancient India showed always a tendency to go to the extremes; and eventually, we find that the darker side of these sects is also depicted in early Indian literature. Nay, there was another reason for this, namely, that the more orthodox school of Brahmanism always tried to keep the followers of these different sects rather outside the pale of Brahmanism. Hence the Purāṇas and other allied literature have naturally depicted these sects as being of ghastly character. Hence the various statements occurring in early literature in regard to the Vrātya sects must be weighed with due caution. The Kāpālikas, Kālāmukhas and some of the other sects practised the rites of animal and human sacrifice. All the Vrātya sects had their own distinctive marks. 'We had, for instance, the Śaivas who had the Liṅga branded on both the arms, the Raudras who had the trident branded on their forehead, the Ūgras who had the Ḍamaru branded on both the arms the Bhāṭṭas who had the Liṅga branded on the forehead, the Jaṅgamas who bore the trident on the head and carried a Liṅga of stone on their persons, and the Pāśupatas who had the Liṅga branded on the forehead, arms, heart and navel, and the Mallāris, the Kāpālikas, the Kālāmukhas, respectively.'[1]

It should be noted at the outset that the various appellations Pāśupata, Māhēśvara and Mahāvratadhara are frequently applied to the followers of more than one sect.

1. THE YATIS

The Yatis seem to be the most ancient Vrātya ascetics known to literature. The early Mohenjo Darians were keen adepts in the methods of Yoga. Some of the Mīnas are described to have been dwelling in the caves and meditating on the third eye of Śiva (cf. Part V). Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has rightly observed that the Vaikhānasas were apparently the same as the Munis and that the Yatis probably belonged to the Asura community who did not worship Indra.[2]

The Yatis are first referred to in the *Ṛgveda* in connection with the Bhṛgus.[3] The *Atharvaveda* also makes a mention of them.[4] In the *Ṛgveda* the Yatis are credited with the act of creating all existing things to grow.[5] It is worth noting that

1. Pai, *Religious Sects in India among the Hindus*, p. 69.
2. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 18.
3. *Ṛgvēda*, VII. 56. 8.
4. *Atharvavēda*, XX. 9. 9; XX. 49.
5. *Ṛgvēda*, X. 72. 7.

the various Saṁhitās, while calling Indra as a friend of Munis, depict him as being the direct enemy of the Yatis. The *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* states:

'Indra gave the Yatis to the Sālāvṛkas; then they ate on the right of the high altar;...and (as D. R. Bhandarkar observes) in the same breath we are told that 'they overcame the Asuras, their foes.'[1]

The *Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa* also mentions that, '(Indra) cast down Vṛtra, threw Yatis before Sālāvṛkas...'[2] It is these Yatis who are called as Sannyāsins in later times; and they form the fourth Āśrama during the Upaniṣadic period.

The Munis and Keśins

The *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda* make a mention of the long-haired Munis and Keśins. The Munis have been declared as being the friends of Indra.[3] They are described as wearing garments, 'soiled and yellow hue,' and as being wind-clad (naked) at the girdle.[4] One of the Ṛgvedic hymns depicts the Muni as drinking Viṣa or water (poison in the later period) along-side of Rudra.[5] The *Atharvaveda* gives an interesting description of the Keśins.[6]

The *Ṛgveda*, as we have observed above, refers to the Yatis who belonged to the non-Aryan tribes. In the light of the same, one finds that the order of the Munis and Keśins must have come into existence partly as an imitation of the old order of the Yatis. Evidently the Brāhmans of the later period seem to have turned this new order into that of the third Āśrama of the Vaikhānasas. The reference in the *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* is specific in this connection. It states that, 'Indra restored to life Vaikhānasas who had been killed by the Asuras at a place called *Munimaraṇa*.'[7] D. R. Bhandarkar rightly observes that, 'this shows that Vaikhānasas were apparently the same as the Munis.'[8] Evidently the fourth Āśrama of the Yatis was added later on.

2. THE ARHATS

The Arhats were another ancient Vrātya sect. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* refers to the Arhats, Śramaṇas, etc. Strikingly enough the *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*[9], while referring to the cult of the Vrātyas, refers to their various divisions which also include the Arhats and the Yaudhas. Keith and some other scholars interpreted the word Arhat as meaning a Brāhman. But the Arhats were actually saints as Dr. Bhandarkar would propose it[10]. In Buddhism and Jainism the word Arhat generally means one who has reached the stage of salvation. In Buddhist literature the word was applied to Buddhist '*arahats*', or to those belonging to other communities.[11] The former must have reached the end of the Eight-fold path; whereas

1. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, VI. 2. 7. 5.
2. *Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa*, VII. 28.
3. *Ṛgveda*, VIII. 17. 14.
4. *Ibid*, X. 136.
5. Cf. *Supra*.
6. *Atharvaveda*, XI. 2. 18-31.
7. *Pañcaviṁśa Brā.*, XIV. 4. 7.
8. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
9. *Pañcaviṁśa Brā.*, XVII, 53. 2.
10. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, p. 39.
11. Cf. *Vinaya*, i. 30-32; *Saṁyutta*, ii. 220.

the latter must have attained to the ideal of that particular community to what was regarded in it as the fit state for a religious man. The word was also used in an equivalent sense of '*Bhagavat*'.

Whatever may be the later connotation of the word, one fact is certain, that the *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, which is of a pre-Buddhist date, refers to the existence of the Arhats as a part and parcel of the Vrātya civilization originally. But once the expression was adopted by the so-called heterodox religious systems[1] like Buddhism and Jainism, the Hindus parted with it once for all.

3. THE GARAGIRS

Another early S'aiva sect mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas is that of the Gārāgirs. While detailing the different divisions of the Vrātyas, the *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* refers to the Gārāgirs 'to whom commoners' victuals taste like Brāhman's food.'[2] Dr. Bhandarkar calls them 'swallowers of poison.' His remarks in this connection are very significant. He says that, 'this reminds us of one aspect of Śiva, namely, Nīlakaṇṭha, who became 'blue-throated' because he swallowed the deadly poison called *hālāhala*, which was churned out of the ocean. This is doubtless the Paurāṇic way of explaining how Śiva became Nīlakaṇṭha. Originally, however, 'the god must have been credited with swallowing poison. Even to this day there are some votaries of Śiva, who take delight in showing their indifference to wordly objects by eating and drinking not only ordure and carrion,[3] but also poisonous acids and nails.'

4. THE PASUPATAS

Introductory—Their main Tenets.

We have already observed that the various S'aiva sects, namely, the Yatis, Arhats, Gārāgirs, etc. had come into vogue during the early Vedic and the Brāhmaṇic period. But immediately after the writing of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* we find the emergence of a new sect of the Pāśupatas, with a definite theology and order of their own. The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* introduced in the philosophical system of the Vrātyas expressions like, Paśu, Pāśa, etc. And soon after, the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* dealt in detail with the theology of the Pāśupata school.

The *Śāntiparvan* mentions five systems of philosophy e.g. (1) Sāṅkhya, (2) Yoga, (3) Pāñcarātra, (4) Vedas, and (5) Pāśupata. The system is said to have been proclaimed by the god Śrīkaṇṭha Śiva, husband of Umā and Lord of the Bhūtas.[4] The same work again mentions that Śiva promulgated the *Pāśupata-vrata*.[5] It is also

1. 'In the general sense, every Buddha was an Arhat; Rāhula claims to be an Arhat. Even about 73 women are said to have become Arhats during Buddha's life-time': *E. R. E.*, Rhys Davids, pp. 774 ff.
2. *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, XVII, 1. 9.
3. Wilson, *Essays on the Religion of the Hindus*, pp. 233-34.
4. Cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII, 349, Vs. 64 and 67 (Bom. Ed.).
5. *Ibid*, Chap. 208, 95.

worth noting that the Anuśāsana gives a detailed account of the mode of worship of the Liṅga, and the Pāśupata-vrata.[1]

With the adoption of Pāśupata-vrata into their own fold by the Brāhmans, a new distinction seems to have come into vogue. The *Kūrma Purāṇa* makes a specific distinction between the Śrauta and the Aśrauta Pāśupatas.

The Brāhmans seem to have followed only the Śrauta Pāśupata.[2] And with the emergence of the school of Lakulīśa Pāśupatas, the non-Brahman section of people seems to have followed only the latter.

The Purāṇas make a frequent mention of the Pāśupata-Yoga.[3] Perhaps this must have been an extension of the same which was practised by the Vrātyas originally. The Pāśupatas attained great popularity in later centuries. Yuan Chwang refers to the followers of Mahēśvara either as cinder-sprinkled or *Po-shu-po-to.*[4] Rāmānuja, in his eminent work the *Śrī-Bhāṣya*, speaks of the four classes of S'aivas e. g. (1) Kāpāla, (2) Kālāmukha, (3) Pāśupata, and (4) Śaiva.[5] Govindānanda and Vācaspati in their commentaries on the *Brahma-sūtra-Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya*, refer to the Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kāruṇikasiddhāntin and the Kāpālika sects.

The Main Tenets

The *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* deals with the main tenets of the Pāśupata school, as they were propounded then. We are giving a summary of the same below :[6]

The gods, it is said, went to heaven and asked Rudra who he was. He said that he alone was, is, or will be, and nothing else. He is in all the quarters, he is Gāyatrī, man, woman, etc. Rudra afterwards became invisible to them. Then they raised their arms and praised him saying: 'He, who is Rudra, Mahēśvara, Umā, Skanda, Vināyaka, the Sun, etc., The Oṁkāra is mentioned, to which many epithets, and epithets of epithets expressive of divine attributes are given, and lastly, it is called the one Rudra, who is Īśāna, Bhagavata, Mahēśvara and Mahādeva. We need not enter here into the various etymologies regarding the epithets and names proposed here.

---

1. *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana P.*, Adh. 247.
   The ascetics are described as :

   तेन संदिग्धसर्वाङ्गा भस्मना ब्रह्मचारिणः ।
   जटिला मुण्डिता वाऽपि नानाकारशिखण्डिनः ॥ १५ ॥
   विकृताः पिङ्गलाभिश्च नग्ना नानाप्रकारिणः ।
   भैक्षं चरन्तः सर्वत्र निःस्पृहा निष्परिग्रहाः ॥ १६ ॥
   शूलपाणयहस्ता मद्भक्ता मन्निवेशितबुद्धयः ।
   चरन्तो निखिलं लोकं मम हर्षविवर्द्धनाः ॥ १७ ॥

2. Cf. *Supra*.
3. *Linga, Pūrva-bhāga*, Adh. 8, Vs. 88-100 ; *Skānda*, 5, 3, 11, 19 ; *Kāśī-khaṇḍa*, 69. 160 ; *Kūrma*, Adh. 11.
4. Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, p. 353.
5. *Śrī-Bhāṣya, Brahmasūtras*, II, 2. 36.
6. R.G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (Old Edition), pp. 111-12.

The Vow.

Śaṅkarānanda gives the substance of the remaining portion of the Upaniṣad: 'For the knowledge of Rudra one should use moderate food, devote himself to reading (Śravaṇa), thinking (Manana), etc., become a Paramahaṁsa, or a single-minded devotee, and spend his time thus. One should undertake the Pāśupata vow (*vrata*) which is of the following nature. Greed and anger should be given up. Forgiveness should be realized. The muttering of Oṁ should be practised, and meditation resulting in Avagati, or perception, should be resorted to. The text of which this is the explanation may be generally rendered thus: 'In the inside of the heart exists the subtle body, in which there are anger, greed and forgiveness. Destroying greed, which is at the bottom of human motives, and concentrating the mind on Rudra, who is one and eternal, one should be moderate in eating and drinking.' Then follows the precept to besmear the body with ashes by repeating the words: 'The ash is fire, the ash is water, the ash is earth, everything is ash; the ether is ash, the mind, the eyes and other senses are ash.' This is the Pāśupata vow (*vrata*) enjoined for the removal of the noose with which the Paśu, or the individual soul is tied'.[1]

5. THE LAKULISA-PASUPATAS

The problem regarding the origin of the Lakulīśa sect is still shrouded in mystery. As early as 1901, Fleet, mainly depending on two inscriptions from Balēgāmi in Mysore (A. D. 1035)[2] and Melpadi (A. D. 1019 or 1020) respectively, proposed that Lakulīśa, who was then alive, began his career at Melpadi in the North Arcot District, Madras; that from there he went to Balēgāmi and attached himself to one of the great Śaiva establishments at that place, namely, the college of the Kāḷāmukhas of the temple of Pañcaliṅga; and that later on he proceeded to Gujarat, and then settling at Kārvān in the Baroda State, founded there the school of Pāśupatas which carried on the memory of him for so long a time.[3] Gopinatha Rao[4], Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar[5] and some other scholars maintain that Lakulīśa (holder of a *Lakula*, *Laguḍa* i. e. a club) was the founder of the sect, and that the sect seems to have come into existence in Gujarat in about the 1st century A. D. Before entering into the *pros* and *cons* of the problem we shall study the details of the sources on which these scholars mainly depend.

Sources.

The main sources of information are:

(1) The *Cintra-Praśasti*, composed between A. D. 1274–1296[6], mainly states: 'that Śiva became incarnate in the form of Bhaṭṭāraka Śrī Lakulīśa, and came to and dwelt at Kārohaṇa in the Lāṭa country, in order to favour the offspring of Uluka, who were deprived of sons in consequence of a curse of their father, and that for the strict performance of the Pāśupata vows there appeared in bodily form four pupils of his

1. *Ibid.* 2. *E. I.*, Vol. v, p. 227. 3. *I. A.*, xxx, pp. 1 and 2.
4. Gopinatha Rao, *E. H. I.*, II. i, p. 19.
5. D. R. Bhandarkar, '*An Ekalingjī Stone Ins.* etc.,' *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, xxii, pp. 151 ff.'
6. Cf. *Cintra-Praśasti*, published by Bühler, *E. I.*, i, pp. 211 ff.

called Kuśika, Gārgya, Kauruṣa, and Maitrēya who became the originators of four branches.'

(2) The Ekalingjī stone inscription (971 A. D.)[1] mentions the story thus:

'In the country of Bhṛgu-Kaccha i. e. Broach, through which the Narmadā, daughter of Mēkala, flows, the sage Bhṛgu, being cursed by Murabhid (Viṣṇu), propitiated God Śiva, who in the presence of that very sage, incarnated himself as characterised with a club (*lakula*) in his hand. As Śiva thus descended to earth in body, the place where this occurred was called Kāyāvarohaṇa. Further, it is said, that there lived ancient sages such as Kuśika and others, who were conversant with the Pāśupata Yoga, and who restored to use of ashes, barks, and matted hair. Then certain ascetics whose fame had spread from the Himālayas to Rāma's Bridge always worshipped the god Ekaliṅga, and by them was caused to be made this temple of Lakulīśa on the mountain Aśvagrāma.'

(3) *The Hemavatī (Mysore) inscription* (A. D. 943)[2] registers a grant for the god Nannīśvara to Bhaṭṭāra Cilluka about whom it is said that Lakulīśa, being afraid that his name and doctrine might be forgotten, was born as Munināthа Cilluka.

(4) The *Vāyu*[3] and the *Liṅga Purāṇas*[4] state that, 'in the 28th Yuga when Viṣṇu, son of Parāśara, will incarnate himself as Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, Kṛṣṇa will become incarnate as Vāsudēva. At that time, I (Śiva) shall as Brahmacārī enter a dead body thrown in a cemetery without anybody to guard it, by means of Yogic powers, and shall bear the name Lakuli. At that time, Kāyārohaṇa (acc. to the *Vāyu*), or Kāyāvatāra (acc. to the *Liṅga*), will become famous as a sacred place and remain so till the earth endures. And there will be born the ascetic-pupils Kuśika, Garga, Mitra, and Kauruṣya, and these Pāśupatas will repair to the Rudra-loka, whence they will not return'.

Besides, the *Kūrma Purāṇa*[5] also details the *Avatāras* of Mahādēva, the last of these incarnations being Na (La) kulīśvara, with the names of his pupils Kuṇika, Garga, Mitraka and Ruru, being probably a corrupted version of the original names Kuśika, Garga, Mitra and Kaurusya. Added to this there are the inscriptions found at Melpadi and Balēgāmi (cf. *Supra*).

With the exception of the Haimavatī inscription and the account of the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, we may say with Dr. Bhandarkar in regard to all the other documents, that, 'though the three accounts differ so far as the origin of the Lakulīśa incarnation goes, still they all perfectly agree as regards the principal points, *viz.* that (1) Lakuli was an incarnation of Mahādēva, that (2) this incarnation took place at Kāyāvarohaṇa

1. Cf. Bhandarkar, *op cit.*, p. 151.
2. *E. C.*, xii, p. 92 (Trans.).
3. *Vāyu P.*, Adh. xxiii. 217-275.
4. *Liṅga P.*, xxiv. 124-133.
5. *Kūrma P.*, *Pūrvabhāga*, Adh. 53. pp. 439 ff.; cf. also *Śiva P.*, *Uttara-khaṇḍa* 3, Adh. 1-2.

and that (3) these were four ascetic-pupils of Lakuli, whose names, mentioned in the Purāṇas, are identical with those given in the Cintra-Praśasti.[1]

Dr. Bhandarkar, by placing the *Vāyu Purāṇa* in about the 4th cen. A.D., contends that the incarnation of Śiva as Lakuli, to become a general belief and come to be spoken about in this Purāṇa, must be placed as early as the first cen. A. D. at the latest.[2] He further proposes that Lakulīśa seems to have been a historical personage mainly on the ground, that, (i) he is always represented with two hands, (ii) that Sāyaṇa refers as: *Taduktam-Bhagavatā-Nakulīśena*, 'so is (it) said by the Lord Nakulīśa', and finally, (iii) that the Hēmavatī inscription says that Lakulīśa became incarnate in the form of Chilluka in order that his name and doctrine might not be forgotten.'[3]

In view of what has been said by the learned scholar so far, one cannot be easily convinced with the line of argumentation followed by Fleet, namely, that the doctrine was first propounded by a living person at Melpadi and that it travelled to Balēgāmi, and finally to Karwan, in the Dabhoi Taluka, Baroda *Prant*, Baroda State. Gopinatha Rao adduced one more evidence, namely, that the authors of the famous *Devāram* hymns have sung the praises of the Śiva temples at Nāgapaṭṭam (Nēgāpaṭṭam) and Kumbhakoṇam, which were known even in their time by the name of Kāyārohaṇa or Kārōṇa, so named evidently after the more famous place of that name in Northern India.[4] Added to this, the five categories of the Pāśupata doctrine referred to by Śaṅkara are the same as those propounded by the Lakulīśa Pāśupatas. In view of this the other accounts coming from Southern India seem to be fabulous. We agree with Bhandarkar's view.

There is another instance which corroborates very strongly the theory proposed by Dr. Bhandarkar. The Mathurā Pillar inscription of Candragupta II, Vikramāditya, records that, in A. D. 380 Uditācārya installed the images of his *guru* and *guru's guru*, Kapila and Upamita respectively, in the *Gurvyāyatana*.[5] Uditācārya is said to have been the tenth *guru* after Kuśika, the direct disciple of Lakulīśa. Nilakanta Sastri also observes that, 'this inscription furnishes valuable testimony to the continuity of the *Gurusantāna* (chair of teachers) from the founder of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupata, and to the practice of conserving images possibly portraits of the successive *gurus*, in a gallery set apart for the purpose.[6]

Pasupata and Lakulisa-Pasupata

But while accepting the view proposed by Dr. Bhandarkar regarding the founder of the new sect, one shall have to make a distinction between the orginal Pāśupata doctrine handed down from the ancient times, through the *Mahābhārata* and the Upaniṣadic period, and this new sect. As has been pointed out above, the *Kūrma Purāṇa*

---

1. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 155. 2. *Ibid*, p. 157. 3. *Ibid.*
4. Gopinatha Rao, *E. H. I.*, II. i, p. 19.
5. D. R. Bhandarkar, *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, xxii (1908), p. 151; *Arch. Survey of India, An. Rep.* 1906-7, p. 179; *E. I.*, xxi, p. 7.
6. Nilakanta Sastri, 'A Historical sketch of S'aivism', *Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. II, pp. 26-27.

makes a distinction between the *Śrauta* and the *Aśrauta Pāśupata*, and further makes a distinction between the Pāśupata and the Lākula. Thus from this and some other passages occurring in the Purāṇas it seems that the founder of the Lakulīśa sect gave a new garb to the already existing system. It should also be noted that the Lakulīśa Pāśupatas used to besmear themselves with sand instead of ashes.

Spread of the Lakulisa Sect

The Lakulīśa sect seems to have spread at one time right from Kashmir down to the precincts of the Mysore State. The Ekaliṅgjī inscription states that, when 'Śiva made himself incarnate, he was *Lakulopalakṣita-kara*', i. e. with his hand characterised by a *lakula*, i. e. apparently *lakula* or *laguḍa*, a club. He is always represented in a nude posture. There are many old temples in Rajputana, above the doorways of whose shrines or halls is carved a singular figure of Śiva, with two hands with curly hair, long ear-lobes, peculiar *āsana* or sitting posture, and one of his hands invariably holding a club, and the other often a cocoa-nut.[1] Lakulīśa was worshipped in the Nātha temple itself. Further, at Māndhāta, situated on the river Narmadā, Lakulīśa figures on the projecting block on the lintel of the shrine door-frame of the temple of Siddhēśvara on the top of the hill.[2] In the Dumar-lēṇā, in the North verandah and in the East end are two images of Lakulīśa.[3] An image of Lakulīśa, belonging to the seventh century, is found at Jhārapāṭan, Gujarat. There are also some images of Lakulīśa obtaining in the famous temple of Kailāsa at Ēlūrā. Balēgāmi, in Mysore, was a great centre of Lakulīśa, and the Kāḷāmukhas are said to have been well-versed in the Lākulāgama (cf. under *Kāḷāmukhas*).

An interesting account is given by the Muttage Saṅgamēśvara temple inscription.[4] It states that, 'Vāṇī came with that sage (Kaśmīramuni) to stay at Bijāpūr. His disciple Kāḷabhairavadeva was a great disputant and was proficient in Vedānta philosophy. The last of this line of disciples Lakulīśa was learned in Śiva-tattva; he was the crest-jewel of devotees; and he was the moon to the ocean of nectar that was Lākulāgama.' The genealogy given in the inscription is as follows:

Bhujaṅga-dēva
|
Trilocana-deva
|
Balisūryamuni
|
Kāśmīra-paṇḍita-deva
|
Kāla-Bhairava-paṇḍita-deva
|
Yogīśvara-paṇḍita-deva
|
Acalēśvaradeva *alias* Varēśvaradeva
|
Yogīśvaradeva
|
Lakulīśvaradeva (1147 A. D.)

1. D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 159. 2. *Ibid.* 3. *Ibid*, p. 160.
4. Kundangar, 'Pāśupata and Saiva Sects', *Karnāṭaka Historical Review*, pp. 19 ff.

In South India the sect seems to have divided itself into two classes i.e. (1) old, and (2) new, as can be seen from an inscription found at Gotnakere in the Tiptur *Taluka*, Mysore (A.D. 1285), which speaks of the donors as supporters of the new *Lā (La) kula-Samaya*[1].

System of the Lakulisa-Pasupatas

The philosophy as propounded by the school of the Lakulīśa–Pāśupatas is mentioned by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras.* Sir R. G. Bhandarkar states that, 'a work of the name of *Pañcādhyāyī*, dealing with the five topics alluded to above and attributed to Paśupati, mentioned by Keśava Kāśmīrin and quoted by Rāmānanda in *Kāśīkhaṇḍa*, must be the same which is quoted from by Mādhava in the section on Nakulīśa–Pāśupata and attributed by him to Nakulīśa or Lakulīśa.[2]

The system has been strongly criticised by Śaṅkara on the ground that the Pāśupatas regard God as operative and not the material cause of the world. Both Śaṅkara and his commentators have described the following five topics as forming the main tenets of this system. They are [3] :

(1) Effect (*Kārya*), is the Mahat and the rest produced from Pradhāna.

(2) Cause (*Kāraṇa*), is Īśvara or Maheśvara and also Pradhāna.

(3) Union (*Yoga*), is absorption in meditation or the muttering of the syllable Oṁ, contemplation, concentration, etc.

(4) Rite or Process (*Vidhi*), bathing (in ashes) at the three points of time e. g. the beginning, the middle and the end of the day, and the rest up to Gūḍhacaryā i. e. incognito movement, and

(5) *Cessation of misery* (*Dukkhānta*), is final deliverance.

Mādhava gives the main tenets of the system in his *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha*. The following account is from his work:

(1) *Effect* (*Kārya*) is dependant and of three kinds e. g. (1) Sentiency (vidyā), (2) insentient (kalā), and the sentient. Sentiency is of two kinds: (1) external and (2) internal. The external sentiency or cognition can be divided into two kinds: distinct (citta) and indistinct.

The organs can be divided into (1) effects, and (2) causes. The effected organs are: the five elements, earth and others, and the five qualities, colour and others. The organs, which are causes, are of thirteen kinds e. g. the five senses, the five organs of action, and three internal organs, e. g. intelligence, egoism and mind.

The sentient or the Paśu (individual) is of two kinds e. g. (1) pure, and (2) impure. The former is free from the clutches of bondage, and the latter is not free from bondage.

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op.cit.*, p. 163; *E.C.*, xii, p. 45 (Trans); *Ibid*, Intro. p. 10.
2. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism*, etc., Collected Works, IV, p. 173.
3. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, S'aivism and other minor Systems* (Collected Works of Sir R. G. B. IV), pp. 173 ff; also Mādhava's *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha* (Trans. by Cowell and Gough).

We have followed the translation of Cowell and Gough.

(2) *Cause* (*Kāraṇa*). Sir R. G. Bhandarkar describes that Kāraṇa is that which effects the destruction of the whole creation and its prosperity or promotion. Though it is one, still on account of its various properties and functions it has many forms, such as Lord (Pati), naturally powerful (Sādya), etc. He is the eternal ruler, who has unbounded power of knowing and acting. He is a Supreme Sovereign (*Sādya*).[1].

(3) Union (*Yoga*) is conjunction of the soul with God through the intellect (*citta*), and is of two kinds e. g. that characterized by action, and that characterized by cessation of action. The first consists of pious muttering, meditation, and so forth. Union characterized by cessation of action is called consciousness, etc.

(4) *Rite or Process* (*Vidhi*) is activity efficacious of merit as its end. It is of two kinds: the principal and the subsidiary. The first is the direct means of merit, religious exercise. Religious exercise is of two kinds: acts of piety and postures. The acts of piety are bathing with sand (or ashes as Bhandarkar would have it), lying upon sand, oblations, mutterings, and devotional perambulation. As Nakulīśa says:

'He should bathe thrice a day, he should lie upon the dust. Oblation is an observance divided into six members'.

Or, as the author of the aphorisms says:

'He should worship with the six kinds of oblations, viz. laughter, song, dance, muttering *hum*, adoration, and pious ejaculation.'

Laughter is a loud laugh, Ahā, Ahā, by dilation of the throat and lips. Song is a celebration of the qualities, glories, etc. of Maheśvara, according to the conventions of the Gandharvaśāstra, or art of music. The dance also is to be employed according to the *ars saltatoria*, accompanied with gesticulations with hands and feet, with motions of limbs, and with outward indication of internal sentiment. The ejaculation *hum* is a sacred utterance, like the bellowing of a bull, accomplished by a contact of the tongue with the palate, an imitation of the sound *hundung* ascribed to a bull, like the exclamation Vaṣaṭ. This must all be done in secret if there are uninitiated people.

The postures are of five kinds: (1) snoring (*krathana*), (2) trembling (*spandana*), (3) limping (*mandana*), (4) acting with amorous gestures or wooing (*śṛṅgāraṇa*), (5) acting absurdly (*avitathākaraṇa*), and (6) talking nonsensically (*avitadbhāṣaṇa*).

Snoring is showing all the signs of being asleep while really awake. Trembling is a convulsive movement of the joints as if under an attack of rheumatism. Limping is walking as if the legs were disabled. Wooing is simulating the gesture of an *innamorato* on seeing a young and pretty woman. Acting absurdly is doing acts which everyone dislikes as if bereft

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

of all sense of what should and what should not be done. Talking nonsensically is the utterance of words which contradict each other, or which have no meaning, and the like.

The secondary religious exercise is purificatory, subsequent ablution for putting an end to the sense of unfitness from begging, living on broken food, etc. The author of the *Sūtras* says that one should bear the marks of purity after the worship and wear the faded flowers and leaves which have been removed from the God and Liṅga.

(5) *Final Deliverance* (*Dukkhānta*) is of two kinds, impersonal and personal. Of these, the impersonal consists in the absolute extirpation of all pains; the personal in supremacy consisting of the visual and active powers. Of these two powers, the visual, while only one power is, according to its diversity of objects, is indirectly describable as of five kinds : vision (*darśana*), audition (*śravaṇa*), cogitation (*manana*), discrimination (*vijñāna*), and omniscience (*sarvajñatva*).

The active power, though one only, is indirectly describable as of three kinds: *Manojavitva*—the possession of the swiftness of thought, *Kāmarūpitva*—the faculty of assuming forms at will, and *Vikramaṇadharmitva*—the faculty of expatiation. Of these, the possession of the swiftness of thought is ability to act with unsurpassable celerity. The power of assuming forms at will is the faculty of employing at pleasure, and irrespective of the efficacy of works, the organs similar and dissimilar of an infinity of organisms. The faculty of expatiation is the possession of transcendental supremacy even when such organs are not employed.

Pasupata and other Philosophical Systems

Mādhava has beautifully summarized the main tenets of the Pāśupata system as distinguished from those of others: The cessation of pain (or emancipation) is in other systems (as in the Sāṅkhya) the mere termination of miseries, but in this system it is eternal, the spirits and so forth, the sentient and the insentient. In other systems the *principium* is determined in its evolution or creative activity by the efficacy of words, whereas in this system the *principium* is the Lord not thus determined. In other systems union results in isolation, etc. while in these institutes it results in cessation of pains by the attainment of the divine perfection. In other systems paradise and similar spheres involve a return to metempsychosis, but in this system they result in nearness to the Supreme Being either followed or not followed, by such return to transmigratory experiences.

6. THE KAPALIKAS

Like the other earlier Śaiva sects i.e. the Yatis, the Gārāgirs and the Arhats, the Kāpālikas also seem to be of very ancient origin. They were so called because they worshipped Kapālin or Śiva. The earliest reference made to them is in the *Maitri Upaniṣad*, wherein they are styled as thieves. The Upaniṣad also ordains

that 'one should not reside with them'.[1] We have already observed before that they are spoken of with contempt in the Purāṇic literature.

Yuan Chwang [2] and Varāhamihira[3] make a mention of the Kāpālikas. The inscriptions of the Āndhra period refer to the Kāpālinīs or female Kāpālika ascetics.[4] The *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* relates many stories in regard to them. Their activities are recorded even in later literature. The Kāpālikas seem to have originally spread in the various parts of India. But later on, as Kṛṣṇamiśra says, 'the Digambaras and the Kāpālikas quitting all the countries gradually retired to the Mālava and Ābhīra countries, which are inhabited by low class men (*pāmaras*)'.[5] In the later period, Guṇaratna, the commentator of *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya* refers to their identification with the Lokāyatas.[6] In one of the inscriptions belonging to the first half of the seventh century A. D. the God Kapāleśvara and his ascetics called Mahāvratadharas are mentioned.

During the earlier period the rites and practices of the Kāpālikas seem to have been of a revolting nature. Varāhamihira refers to them as follows: 'their sacred thread consisted of hair, their rosaries consisted of human bones, they held in their hands skulls which were besmeared with blood, and they wore matted hair which they ornamented with pieces of bones'.[7] The Jain King Mahēndravarman, who was converted to Śaivism later on, depicts the character of a Kāpālika in his famous work *Mattavilāsa-Prahasana*, in the following manner: 'The Kāpālika speaks in derision of other cults, howls out the sacred Śiva Mantra '*Namaḥ Śivāya*', and goes immediately to the drink shop in company with his prostitute. He says that the tavern resembles the Yāga-śālā, hall of the sacrifice, and after prattling in this fashion, he misses his begging bowl. He thinks that it must have been either carried away by a dog or stolen away by a Śākya Bhikṣu. He then comes across the Buddhist monks; an altercation ensues, but no settlement is reached, when a Pāśupata appears on the scene who is equally unable to end the dispute. Then a madman (*unmatta*) comes with the bowl in his hand. He had recovered it from a dog who had carried it away. The madman seems to have delighted in eating the remnants of what was eaten by a dog.[8]

The famous play *Mālatī-Mādhava* of Bhavabhūti introduces the scene of an attempt by a Kāpālin named Aghoraghaṇṭa, to sacrifice to Cāmuṇḍā, the noble lady Mālatī, procured for the purpose by a female pupil of his, significantly named Kapālakuṇḍalā, 'wearing skulls as ear-rings'. The scene is laid (Act V) inside the temple of Cāmuṇḍā, situated in a fowl-smelling cemetery peopled by a host of skeleton goblins, their fleshless bones bound only by their sinews within their black and shrivelled skins, vast blood-dripping tongues lolling from their jaws. The horrible get up of both Cāmuṇḍā and her priestess Kapālakuṇḍalā is described with sultry imaginations. Skulls figure in both. 'Every skull that gems thy necklace laughs with horried life',

1. *Maitri Upanisad*, vii, 8.
2. *St. Juliens Voyages des Pe'lerius Buddhists*, t. i, p. 222.
3. *Bṛhat-saṁhitā*, LXXXVII, 22, 432, Ed. Kern.
4. Cf. *Supra*.
5. Cf. Sastri, '*The Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas*', vii, p. 128.
6. *Ibid*, p. 130.
7. *Bṛhat-saṁhitā*, 97, 13-14 and 20.
8. Cf. also Ayyer, *Śaivism in South India*, p. 258.

says Kapālakuṇḍalā, describing Cāmuṇḍā. Kapālakuṇḍalā also tells rather vaguely why Mālatī is to be sacrificed: 'My wise teacher Aghoraghaṇṭa calls me to aid him in the powerful rite that ends his toils; to-day he offers the gem of womankind, a victim to the Goddess'.[1]

In regard to the observance of the cult of human sacrifice, the *Pārśvanātha Caritra* (2.288) describes that, 'Kālī praises a Kāpālika who is ever collecting skulls for her, and is just about to achieve the 108th skull by which means she is to fulfill her purpose. There are also other descriptions in regard to the Kāpālikas. The *Daśakumāracaritam* depicts the scene of the wizard Kāpālika: 'His body is ornamented with glittering pieces of skulls; he is smeared with ashes of the funeral fires; he wears braids that look like a streak of lightning; with his left hand he is sacrificing steadily into a fierce fire crackling sesame and mustard. In front of him stands one of the above-mentioned servants with folded hands, saying,' issue your command, where-with can I serve you.' He is told to fetch the princess Kanakalēkhā, and he does so. Afterwards the story relates how she was rescued from this terrible plight.[2]

The Prabodha-candrodaya (A. D. 1065) of Kṛṣṇamiśra depicts the character of a Kāpālika, who is described to have said, 'My necklace and ornaments consist of human bones; I live in the ashes of the dead and eat my food in human skulls. I look with my eyes made keen with ointment of Yoga and I believe that though the different parts of the world are different, yet the whole is not different from God, O Digambara! listen to our rites: after fasting we drink liquor from the skulls of Brāhmaṇas; our sacrificial fires are kept up with the brains and lungs of men which are mixed up with their flesh, and the offerings by which we appease our terrific God are human victims covered with gushing blood from the horrible cut on their throats. I contemplate on the Lord of Bhavānī, the mighty God who creates, preserves and destroys the fourteen worlds, whose glory is revealed in the Vedas as well as in his deeds.'

Śaṅkara, on his visit to Ujjayini, is said to have met the Kāpālikas in a disputation. Anantādri in his *Śaṅkara-vijaya* describes them as a sect having the following characteristic features and doctrines: They wear *Sphaṭika* (crystal beads), the *Ardha-candra* and *Jaṭā*. Their God is Bhairava, the author of creation, protection and destruction; they believe that all other gods are subservient to him. Bhairava has eight different aspects, namely, Asitāṅga, Ruru, Caṇḍa, Krodha, Unmatta-Bhairavar, Kāpāla, Bhīṣma and Saṁhāra Bhairava, corresponding to Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Sūrya, Rudra, Indra, Candra, Yama and the Supreme Being respectively. This class of Kāpālikas was taken by Śaṅkarācārya into the fold of Brahmanism. But another subject of Kāpālikas headed by one *Unmatta-Bhairava* came to wrangle with Śaṅkara; he had smeared his body with the ashes of the dead and wore a garland of skulls and his forehead was marked with a streak of black stuff. The whole of the hair of his head was turned into *jaṭās*. He wore a *Kaṭisūtra* and a *Kaupīna* consisting of a tiger's skin and carried in his left hand a skull and in the right a bell. He

1. Cf. Bloomfield, 'On false Ascetics and Nuns in Hindu Fiction', *J. A. O. S.*, XLIV, pp. 203 ff.
2. *Ibid*, p. 212.

was calling out the names of Śambhū, Bhairava and Kālīśa. He said that their *mokṣa* consisted in joining Bhairava after death. Śaṅkara rejected this class of Kāpālikas as incorrigible.[1]

(a). *Their Efforts towards accruing Siddhis*

It is said that the Kāpālikas sacrificed human victims mainly with the intention of attaining *Siddhis*, or 'Magic science.' The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (20.104) describes that 'human flesh confers the power to fly.' In the story of Amboda human sacrifice is bartered directly for magic power.[2]

(b). *Other Matters*

The Kāpālikas are generally depicted as ascetics 'falling from grace through the lure of beautiful women, or other worldly desires.' A story is related in *Mallinātha-Caritra* (1.29 ff.) as follows: 'Prince Rantnacandra (or Ratnēndra) wanders in a forest, where he hears the wails of a maiden. After appealing to father and mother she cries out · 'Ratnacandra, why do you not save me? A prophet predicted to my father that you would become my husband. Are you asleep or confused in mind?' Ratnacandra runs up, sword in hand, and comes upon the maid, standing, bound hand and feet, by the side of coal-basin, a *Karavīra* wreath upon her head. By her side stands a Kāpālin ascetic (Yogin) who raised sword. After upbraiding the ascetic, who returns in kind, they came to blows, and the ascetic is killed.'[3] Hence the Kāpālikas are described as 'lewd and power-loving.'

(c). *Their Philosophy*

The Kāpālikas are described as having a philosophical treatise of their own, Rāmānuja states that their philosophy is akin to that of the Pāśupatas, Śaivas and Kālāmukhas. He says that, 'they hold that the wearing of the six *Mudrā* badges and the like to be means to accomplish the highest end of man. Thus the Kāpālas say, 'He who knows the true nature of the six *Mudrās*, who understands the highest *Mudrā*, meditating upon himself as in the position called *bhagāsana*, reaches Nirvāṇa. The necklace, the golden ornament, the ear-ring, the head-jewel, ashes, and the sacred thread, are called the six *Mudrās*. He whose body is marked with these is not born here again. By undertaking a *Kapāla* rite a man becomes at once an ascetic.'[4]

Farquhar doubts whether they were at all a sect and opines that, 'they have never been more than an order of ascetics.'[5] It is also interesting to note that like the Cārvākas, the Kāpālikas maintain that a state of salvation in which there is no sense of pleasure should not be aimed at.[6] As D. C. Shastri observs, 'the founder of the Kāpālika school assures that a devotee having attained salvation becomes a Śiva and enjoys the pleasure arising from the company of excellent beauties like

1. Gopinatha Rao, *E.H.I.*, II, pp.27–28;cf. for general description cf. Bloomfield, *op.cit.*, pp. 202 ff.
2. Bloomfield, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
3. Bloomfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 ; cf. another story in *Kathāsaritsāgara*, 121.3 ff.
4. Cf. also Gopinatha Rao, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 ff.
5. Farquhar, *O. R. L. I.*, p. 192.
6. *Prabodha-candrodaya*, III. 16; also *I. H. Q.*, VII, p. 130.

Pārvatī. Their aim is Kāma-sādhanā; they are hedonists'.[1] They used to meet once a year at a particular place and to enjoy to their heart's content all sorts of pleasures, without any let or hindrance.[2] The Kāpālikas are lost sight of in the later period, and their sect is replaced by that of the Aghoris. Shastri observes that, 'it appears that the Lokāyatikas, the Vāmadevas, the Śiśnadevas, the Kāpālikas, the Kālāmukhas, the Aghoris, the Vāmācarins, the Sahajīyas and the Tāntrikas all walk along the same trace with slight difference.[3]

7. THE KĀLĀMUKHAS

One of the most important Śaiva sects which has helped towards the upliftment of the Śaivas in the field of education is that of the Kālāmukhas. Besides the work of the inculcating of the doctrine of Śaivism, the Kālāmukhas, over a long period of about four hundred years (900–1300 A. D.), maintained educational institutions, which were indeed of a very high order. Some of the inscriptions from Mysore relate that they originally came from Kashmir.[4] The earliest mention of the Kāḷāmukhas is made in the Nandī plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Govinda III (c. 18th. Dec. 807 A. D.). It is mentioned therein that on the above day, a grant of a village was made by the above king to Īśvaradāsa, the head of the temple of Nandī. He is designated as a Kāḷāmukha. In the Chikka-Ballāpur Plates dated A. D. 810, he is described as the disciple of Kālaśākti.[5] The sect seems to have survived till the regime of the Rāyas of Vijayanagara.

(a). *Their Order*

The Kāḷāmukhas seem to have been so called because they marked their forehead with a black streak; and that they are said to be born of Nara and Rākṣasa.[6] Rāmānuja in his *Śrī-Bhāṣya* (ii. 2. 36) describes the Kālāmukhas as Mahāvratadharas and also as Laguḍadharas. Many of the inscriptions also relate that they adopted the philosophy propounded by the founder of the Lakulīśa sect.[7] However, some of them followed the tenets of the Śivāgama. The heads of the Koṭīśvara temple at Kuppatur are described as the followers of Śivāgama.[8] Rāmānuja gives rather a ghastly picture of the Kālāmukhas and their order. He says that, 'The Kālāmukhas teach that the means of obtaining all desired results in this world as well as the next are constituted by certain practices such as using a skull as a drinking vessel, smearing oneself with ashes of the dead body, eating the flesh of such a body, carrying a heavy stick, setting up a liquor-jar and using it as a platform for making offerings to the gods, and the like. A bracelet made of Rudrākṣa seeds on the arm, matted hair on the head, a skull, smearing oneself with ashes, etc.'—all this is well-known from the sacred writings of the Śaivas. They also hold that by some special ceremonial performance men of different castes may become Brāhmans and reach the highest Āśrama e.g. 'by merely entering on the initiatory ceremony (Dīkṣā) a man becomes a Brāhman at once'.[9]

---

1. D. C. Shastri, 'The Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas', *I. H. Q.*, VII, p. 131.
2. *Ibid*, p. 132.
3. *Ibid*, p. 135.
4. *E. C.*, vii, Sk. 114; 19; 20.
5. *Q. J. M. S.*, vii, p. 177.
6. Gopinatha Rao, *E. H. I.*, II, i. p 25.
7. *E. C.*, viii, Sk. 275, 276.
8. *E. C.* VIII, Sk. 275, 276.
9. *Śrī-Bhāṣya*, II, 2, 36.

The *Tāraka-rahasya-dīpikā*, a commentary on the *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya* of Guṇaratnasūri (A.D. 1363) informs us, that along with the Pāśupatas, Śaivas and Mahāvratadharas, the Kāḷāmukhas also were married (*sa-strīka*) and people that were unmarried (*nistrīka*) i.e. celebates or Naiṣṭhika Brahmacārins, and that the celebates were esteemed to be better than the married people.[1] Dr. Venkatasubbiah, in his excellent Article observes that the Kāḷāmukhas were divided into divisions and sub-divisions called *parshe*, *avali* and *santali*.[2]

The names borne by the Kāḷāmukha ascetics mostly end in '*Śakti*', '*Śiva*' and '*Ābharaṇa*'. 'While the names ending in Śiva, Rāśi and Ābharaṇa are sometimes borne by Śaivas not belonging to the Kāḷāmukha sect, the names ending in Śakti do not seem to be borne by any but the Kāḷāmukhas.'[3]

The Kāḷāmukhas had spread over a very vast area; and they were generally in charge of the temples. Their important centres were located in the Hasan, Kadur, Chitaldrug, Mysore, Bangalore, Tumkur, Kolar and Shimoga districts; and at other individual places like Abbalur, Hangal, Gadag, the Śrīparvata or Śrīśaila in Kurnool; and generally all over the Kannaḍa country.[4]

Besides their eminent activities, some of the Kāḷāmukha priests also acted as Rājagurus of kings; and eventually the prefix 'Rājaguru' was added to their names. Some of them are prominently known e.g. Sarveśvaraśakti (1255 A.D.), Rudraśakti (A.D. 1250) both of Kuppaṭur; Vāmaśakti of Balegāme, Rudraśakti (1255 A.D.) of Dvārasamudra, and Kriyāśakti, the preceptor of Bukka, Harihara and Devarāya.[5] It is worth noting that the pontiffs of the Koṭīśvara temples are described in the inscriptions as the recipients of the patronage of the Emperors, princes and governors e.g. of the Cālukya Emperor Someśvara II, the Seuṇa Siṅghana, the Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras Īśvaradatta and Droṇapāla, and the Mahāpradhāna Mahādaṇḍanāyaka.

(b). *Their Educational Activities*

Especially during the 11th and 12th centuries the Kāḷāmukhas were busy with educational activities in Karnāṭaka. In fact they managed great educational institutions called Maṭhas which were attached to Śaiva temples. 'The most famous amoung them were the one at Bēlgāme in the neighbouring territory of the Sindas of Bellaguṭṭi, and the other at Hūli in the Kuṇḍi province of the Raṭṭas'. Again the most important of the Maṭhas in the Cālukya dominions were those of Balegāme, Kuppaṭur, Bāndhavapura and Sindagere. At Balegāme it is stated that there was a federation of five Maṭhas called Pañcaliṅga Maṭha, which also included the famous Koḍiya Maṭha.[6] It is said to have been 'a great seat of learning and Kēdāra (i.e. field) where grow crops in the shape of the hair of the human body standing erect from joy at the worship of the Śiva-liṅga, the place appointed for the performance of the rites of the Śaiva Brahmacārin ascetics, the place for the study of the four Vedas, namely, the Ṛg, Yajus, Sāma and the Atharva with the Aṅgas.[7] It is also described that, 'it was the place where

1. Bhandarkar, 'Lakulīśa', *Rep. A. Survey* for 1906–7, p. 190.
   Cf. also *E. C.*, VI, Kd. 16, 29, 143; V, Ak. 104; Be. 117, 119; and Kd. 29.
2. Venkatasubbiah, 'A twelfth century University in Mysore', *Q. J. M. S.*, VII, p. 179.
3. *Ibid*, p. 178.
4. *Ibid*.
5. *Ibid*, p. 179.
6. *E*, *C.*, VII, Sk., 126.
7. *E.C.*, VII, Sk., 102.

commentaries were composed on the Kaumāra, Paṇinīya, Śākaṭāyana, Baudhya, and other six systems of philosophy, where books were composed on the Ākula Siddhānta, on Pātañjala, and other Yogaśāstras, on the eighteen Purāṇas and the Dharma-śāstras, as well as on all kinds of Kāvya and Nāṭaka; a place for all kinds of Nāṭikā (dancing); the place where food was freely distributed to sufferers, to the destitute, to the lame, the blind, deaf, to story tellers, singers, drummers, genealogists, dancers, and eulogists, to the naked, the wounded, Kṣapaṇaka, Ekadaṇḍī, Tridaṇḍī, Haṁsa, Paramahaṁsa, and other beggars from various countries; the place where suitable medicine (was given) to various kinds of diseased persons; a place of security from fear for all living things'.[1] We need not enter into the other details regarding the eminence of the teachers and other allied problems.

8. THE NATHAS OR GORAKHNATHIS

(a). *Introductory*

The expression Nātha is of frequent occurrence in Tāntric Hinduism and Tāntric Buddhism. However, one is not in a position to say whether the Nāthas referred to in early literature (i.e. Dhammapada etc.) have any direct connection with the followers of Gorakhnāth, who are known as Yogīs, Gorakhnāthis, Darśanis, and more popularly Kānphāṭas. The Gorakhnāthis are generally called Nātha in the Punjab and the Himālayas, as Dharmanāthi or Dharamanāthi in Western India and as Kānphaṭa and Gorakhnāthi in other parts of India.[2] The females of the sect are called Nāthnī.

The Gorakhnāthis as a sect seem to be of a non-Aryan origin.[3] The identification of Gorakṣa as a manifestation of Śiva, the legend of a Matsyēndranāth or Mīnanāth as having been born from the fish, their system of Haṭha-yoga consisting of the Kuṇḍalinī (or Tāmiḷ Kuḍalai), their observance of the cult of human sacrifice and of the worship of Śiva and his manifestation Bhairava or Bhairon-all these are clear indications of their Śaivite character.

The shrines and monasteries of the Gorakhnāthis are situated in different parts of India. The most prominent among them are: in the Jungles about Ṛsi-kesh (Hṛṣikesh) on the Ganges, above Haridvār, in Gorakhpūr, the Devīpāṭan temple at Tulsīpur, Benares, at Gorakh Tilla, the Gorakh-kṣētra or Gorkhatri in Peshawar, which are mentioned by Babar and Abul Fazl, at Śrīnagar in Garhwal, the Paśupatināth and Śambhūnāth temples in Nepāl, the Ēkaliṅgjī temple in Rajputana, at Trimbak, situated at a distance of eighteen miles from Nāśik, and at various places in Bengal.

The Nāthas are met with separately as mendicants in various provinces of India e. g. in the Northern Deccan, in the Central Provinces, in Gujarat, in

1. Rice, *Mysore Gaz.*, No. 43.
2. Briggs, *Gorakhnāth and the Kānphaṭas*, p. 1.
3. cf. The Tibetan tradition says that the Kānphaṭas were originally Buddhists and that they became S'aivites in the twelfth century: Levi, *Le Nepal*, Vol. I, pp. 355 ff. But there is no corroborative evidence for this statement.

Mahārāṣṭra, in the Punjab, in the provinces of the Ganges basin, and in Nepal.[1] According to the Census Report of 1911 there were 814, 365 Jogīs and 698,036 mendicants in the whole of India; there being 15,000 Kānphaṭas alone in C. P.[2]

The learned scholar Briggs briefly summarizes the main essentials of their order. According to him, the distinct marks of the sect of the Kānphaṭas are the split-ears (Kān-phaṭa) and huge ear-rings. In the final stage of the ceremony of initiation a specially chosen *guru* or teacher splits the central hollows of both ears with a two-edged knife (razor). The splits are plugged with sticks of *nim*-wood; and after the wounds have healed, large rings (*mudrā*) are inserted. Those are a symbol of the Yogī's faith. Some explain that in splitting the ear a *nāḍī* (mystic channel) in the cartilege is cut, thus assisting in the acquirement of Yogic power. The Yogī, wearing the *Mudrā*, becomes immortal. The rings worn in Western India are about seven inches in circumference and weigh two and a quarter ounces or more.

In Kacch some of the wealthier Yogīs wear gold rings. The rings may be made of clay, gold or rhinoceros' horn, etc. Many women also wear the *Mudrā*. The Yogīs generally mark their forehead with the Tripuṇḍra, or one consisting of a black, horizontal line with a black dot above it, representing Bhairon; and below it a red circle representing Hanumān, or even a single spot, etc. They keep the Dhūni. The general appurtenances of the Yogīs are a bowl, wallet, fire-tongs and a staff or a tri dent of metal. The practices which are in vogue among the Gorakhnāthis are as follows: Making charms for themselves, pronouncing spells and practising palmistry and jugglary, telling fortunes, interpreting dreams, selling a woolen amulet to protect children from the evil eye, and pretending to cure disease, muttering texts over the sick, and practising medicine and exorcism, and vending drugs.[4] In modern times we find the Yogīs following various professions.

(b). *Their Cult*

Like the other Yogīs, the Gorakhnāthis recognize and worship the greater and lesser Gods of the Hindu pantheon. They follow the popular forms of Hindu belief, having concern for saints and other spirits, powers, especially those that are evil; practising magic, exorcism, witchcraft and some primitive medicine; and giving attention to lucky and unlucky days.[5]

Briggs has given some interesting details regarding the superstitious beliefs and taboos held by the Gorakhnāthis.[6] Some Yogīs do not eat fish, thinking that Matsyēndranāth was born from a fish. According to some the red ḍāl (*masūr*) resembles drops of blood. The Nāthas take recourse to magic, charms and drugs. The ear-rings, the thread worn on the wrist, the tooth-pic attached to the sacred thread have all according to them some magic purpose behind them. In many parts of the Koṅkaṇ the Svastik is used as a symbol of Śiva. It is worth noting that the

1. Tessitori, *E. R. E.*, Vol. XII, p. 834.
2. *Census of India*, I, Tables, pp. 192, 198, 309.
3. Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
4. Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
5. *Bombay Gaz.*, xxi, p. 185.
6. Briggs, *op. cit.*, pp. 125 ff.

use of blood is evidenced on every hand in red ochre smeared on images and symbols in the *ṭikā*, and in actual offerings. They treat the following objects as fetishes: Ear-rings made of earth and other substances ; the four ancient Caldrons at Dinodhar, and the numerous Dhūnis, particularly those at Pai Dhūni, Gorakhpur and Dindodhar ; Ganges, etc. The Nāthas worship the *ānola* tree (*phyllanthus emblica*), which is now associated with Śiva. They worship the cow, the pādukās of Gorakhnāth and Matsyēndranāth on the Śivarātrī day. The Yogīs take a keen interest in the rhinoceros, the black buck, dogs and serpents—the last of which are directly associated with Gorakhnāth.

The Gorakhnāthis worship the spirits of the Yogīs at their Samādhis. They also worship the nine Nāthas and eighty-four Siddhas. The nine Nāthas whom they worship are Gorakhnāth, Matsyēndranāth, Carpaṭnāth, Mangalnāth, Ghugonāth, Gopīnāth, Prāṇanāth, Suratnāth and Cambnāth.[1] They officiate as Pūjāris at various temples, especially at those of Bhairon and Śakti and Śiva.[2] Blood sacrifice is common among the Nāthas. In Nepal among animal sacrifices are included the buffalos and goats, and 'an occasional' rhinoceros. The slaughter is carried on a larger scale at Devī-Pāṭan and in Nepal. The Nāthas also perform human sacrifice. They commended *trāga* at Dinodhar, sacrificing one of their own number, so that the guilt of his blood might fall upon the oppressor's head.[3] They generally perform the following festivals: *Navarātrī, Śivarātrī, Nāga-Pañcamī*, Car-festival on the Vaiśākhi-Sudi, the festival of the little Matsyendra at Kāṭhamāṇḍu. The worship of the Śakti is in vogue in the Mahāśivarātrī festival. The Bhairava plays a prominent role in the worship of the Kānphaṭas.

(c). *Date of their Origin*

The solution in regard to the date of the origin of the Nātha sect is still shrouded in mystery. There is plenty of historical and archæological data, and innumerable legends which have made the problem more difficult of solution.

The Kānphaṭas relate a story according to which their sect came into existence even before the creation of the world itself. The story is narrated as follows :

'When Viṣṇu emerged from the lotus at the creation of all things, Gorakhnāth was in Pātāla. Viṣṇu terrified at the waste of waters, went to Pātāla and implored the aid of Gorakhnāth, who, in pity for the deity, gave him a handful of ashes from his fire (*dhūni*), and said to him that if he would sprinkle the ashes over the waters, he would be able to create the world. It happened as Gorakhnāth had promised, and then Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva became the first disciples of Gorakhnāth.[4]

We need not enter here into the various miraculous legends that are described to have taken place in the life of Gorakhnāth. Again there are different traditions which connect Gorakhnāth with different personages, and according to which the dates of Gorakhnāth proposed vary from the 10th to the 16th cen. A. D.

1. In Navanāth-Bhaktisāra (Marāṭhi) the following stanza appears at the end :
गोरक्षजालंधरचर्पटाश्च अडबंगकानीफमच्छिंद्राद्याः । चौरंगिरेवाणकभर्तिसंज्ञा भूम्यां बभूवुर्नवनाथसिद्धाः ॥
2. *Bombay Gaz.*, v, p. 87. 3. *Ibid.* 4. Briggs, *op, cit.*, p. 228.

The opinions of the scholars also vary in this connection. Temple suggests that Gorakhnāth must have flourished in the 8th cen. A. D. Hutchinson proposes a still earlier date. Bhave holds that the Nātha sect was widely spread throughout Mahārāṣṭra about the twelfth century A. D. He places Gorakh in the tenth or the eleventh cen. A. D.[1] Briggs opines that the date of Gorakhnāth can be placed as early as 1100.

But before deciding the question of the date of Gorakhnāth the following points deserve a careful consideration.

The archaeological data

It is well known that the practice of splitting the ears and inserting the huge ear-rings 'is closely associated with Matsyēndranāth and Gorakhnāth, and secondarily with Śiva. Now there are some early representations of Śiva in early Indian art. In the Kailāsa temple at Ellorā, there is a figure of Śiva as a Mahāyogī with the huge ear-rings, worn, however, not as the Kānphaṭas do. A similar figure of Śiva is to be found at Jogēśvarī on Salsette Island, belonging to the second half of the eighth century. Again in the temple of Paraśurāmēśvara there is an image of Śiva with two hands only carved on the Liṅga. Here 'in his right hand he is carrying a ram by its hind legs, and in his left a water bottle. He has a battle axe on his left shoulder.' T. A. Gopinatha Rao places the date of this shrine not later than the second or third century A. D.

Haṭha-yoga: The Tāmiḷ mystic Tirumūlar and the Śāktas show a full knowledge of the doctrine of Kuṇḍalinī and the Haṭha-yōga. Tirumūlar flourished quite earlier. Thus both these data taken independently show that whatever be the date of Gorakhnāth, some of the details of the Gorakhnāthi sect seem to have come into vogue long before him. If this be so, it is just probable that Gorakhnāth must have given a particular shape and form to an order which had come into existence about the second century A. D. Gorakhnāth seems to have flourished about the eleventh century A. D.

(d). *Their Literature*

Briggs has given a list of about forty-seven works which are commonly used by the Gorakhanāthis. Some of them are attributed to the authorship of the Gorakhnāthis. It is proposed to make a brief mention of the same here:

Devī-Bhāgavata, Saptadeva-stotra, Bhagat Sāgar, Satī Sāgar, Durgā Pāt, Bhairavī Pāt, Rāmbodh, Gorakhbodh (c. 14th cen.), Gyān Sāgar, Brahmāṇḍa-sāra-Gītā, Haṭha-Yoga (attributed to Gorakhnāth), Haṭha-Saṁhitā, Caturasītyā sana, Yoga-Cintāmaṇi, on Haṭha-Yoga (by Śivānanda Sarasvati), Yoga-mañjarī, Yoga-sandhyā, Gorakṣa Saṁhitā, Yoga-saṁgraha (by Śukla), Gorakṣa-Kaumudī, Yoga-mārtāṇḍa, Vivekamārtaṇḍa-Yoga (by Rāmeśvara Bhaṭṭa), Gorakṣa-Gītā, Pancāysa-Śiva-Gītā, Haṭha-Saṅketa-Candrikā (by Sundara-Deva), Gorakṣa-sahasra-nāma, Śiva Purāṇa, Nirañjana Purāṇa, Viṣṇu-sahasranāma,

1. He mainly bases his argument on the Paramparā (tradition) given in the *Jñānēśvarī*, the famous commentary on the Gītā by the poet-mystic Jñānēśvār. The Paramparā gives the names of Ādināth and Matsyendranāth as having preceded him.

Viśvānanda Tantra, *Śivarahasya Tantra*, *Rudrayāmala Tantra*, *Haṭha-yoga-pradīpikā* (*by Cintāmaṇi*), *Gheraṇḍa-Saṁhitā*, *Śiva-Saṁhitā*, *Gorakṣa-śataka Jñāna-śataka*, *Jñānaprakāśa - śataka*, *Gorakṣa - śataka-Ṭīkā*, *Gorakṣa - śataka-Ṭippaṇa*, *Gorakṣa-Kalpa*, *Gorakṣa-Paddhati*, *Yoga-siddhānta-Paddhati* (*by Gorakhnāth*), *Siddhānta-Paddhati* (*by Gorakhnāth*), *Siddhasiddhānta-Paddhati* (*by Nityānanda Siddha*), *Yoga-Mahiman*, *and Jñānāmṛta* (*by Gorakhnāth*).

9. THE RASESVARAS

The Śaiva school of the Raseśvaras seems to be of great antiquity. In fact Mādhava quotes the names of various ancient teachers of the school, as well as of several philosophical manuals. But in the absence of any direct evidence we are unable to trace the exact date of the origin of this school. Its main tenets may be summarised in Mādhava's words as follows :[1]

According to the Raseśvaras, the liberation in this life depends upon the stability of the bodily frame, for attaining which mercury or quick-silver is absolutely necessary. Mercury is called Pārada, because it is a means of conveyance beyond the the series of transmigratory states. Thus the *Rasārṇava* says :

"It is styled Pārada, because it is employed for the highest end by the best votaries.

"Since this in sleep identical with me, Goddess, arises from my members, and is the exudation of my body, it is called Rasa."

The ascetic who aspires a liberation in this life should first make to himself a glorified body. And inasmuch as mercury is produced by the creative conjunction of Hara and Gaurī, and mica is produced from Gaurī, mercury and mica are severally identified with Hara and Gaurī. It is said, "Mica is thy seed, and mercury is my seed. The combination of the two, O Goddess, is destructive of death and poverty."

It is also observed that, "By the method of works is attained the preservation of the body ; and the method of works is said to be two-fold, mercury and air : mercury and air, swooning they carry off diseases, dead they restore life, bound they give the power of flying above." Mercury must be continuous, fluent, luminous, pure, heavy, and so that its parts assunder under friction. There are eighteen modes of elaboration : "Sweating, rubbing, stirring, fixing, dropping, cœrcion, restraining, kindling, going, flying into globules, pulverising, covering, internal flux, external flux, burning, colouring, powering, and eating it by parting and piercing it. The quick-silver is to be applied both to the blood and to the body. This makes the appearance of body and blood alike. A man should first try it upon the blood, and then apply it to the body.

The Raseśvaras explain the *summum bonum* of life in the following manner : The attainment of the highest end of the personal soul takes place by an intuition of the highest principle by means of the practice of union after the acquisition of a divine body. Further they describe this state rather more vividly when they say that, "The light of pure intelligence shines forth unto certain men of holy vision which, seated between the two eyebrows, illumines the universe, like fire, or lightning, or the sun :

1. Cowell and Gough, *Sarvadarśana-Saṅgraha* (*Trans.*), pp. 137 ff.

Perfect beatitude, unalloyed, absolute, the essence whereof is luminousness, undifferenced from which all troubles are fallen away, knowable, tranquil, self-recognised: fixing the internal organ upon that, seeing the whole universe manifested, made of pure intelligence, the aspirant even in this life attains to the absolute, his bondage to works annulled." As one of the works proudly says, "the attainment of the sacred quick-silver is more beatific than the worship of all phallic emblems at Kāśī and elsewhere. Inasmuch as there is attained thereby enjoyment, health, exemption from decay, and immortality." The following personages are said to have practised the system: Maheśa, Daityas, Śukra, Munis, Vālakhilyas, King Someśvara, Govindabhāgavata, Govindanāyaka, Carvaṭi, Kapila, Vyāli, Kāpāli and Kandalāyana. The list seems to include some historical personages as well. But in the absence of any other evidence it is difficult to correctly identify them.

10. SOME MINOR SECTS

There are some other minor Śaiva sects. We are giving an account of the same below.

Aghoris

The Aghoris as a sect seem to have been an offshoot of the original Kāpālikas. One Aghoraghaṇṭa is mentioned in the *Mālatī-Mādhava* (cf. under Kāpālikas). They are referred to by the author of the Debistan (middle of the 16th century). They worship the Aghoreśvarī or Aghorīmātā. People of any caste can become converts to this sect. Monier Williams observes that, 'the Aghorapanthīs propitiate Śiva by their revolting diet, feeding on filth and animal excretion of all kinds; some eat corpses stolen from Muhammedan burial-grounds; and that the head of the Aghoris near Siddāpur subsist on scorpions, lizards, and loathsome insects left to putrefy in a dead man's skull.'[1] Their head-quarters are generally at Girnar and Mount Abu.

Jangamas

The Jaṅgamas, who used to place the trident on their heads, now form part of the Liṅgāyats in the South. They are very few in number in Northern India.

Aradhyas

The Ārādhyas or Ārādhya Brāhmans, who are said to have founded the Liṅgāyat sect, wear both the Liṅga and the Yajñopavīta (sacred string) of the Brāhmans. They are generally Smārta Brāhmans.

Soma or Sauma Sect

The Śaivāgamas refer to the Soma-siddhāntins. These seem to be the same as the 'Somas' mentioned in the Purāṇas. Nilakanta Sastri observes, 'the Soma-siddhānta, an obscure branch of Śaivism, of the nature of which several contradictory explanations are vouchsafed to us, may be taken to be the bridge between the Pāśupata and Śākta cults.'[2]

The Dasnamis

The Dasnāmis are the monks belonging to the orders founded by Śaṅkarācārya They are so called because they use one or the other of the following ten names: (1) Sarasvatī, (2) Bhāratī, (3) Purī, (4) Tīrtha,

1. Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp.87-88; cf. also *Āgama-prakāśa*, p.7.
2. Nilakanta Sastri, 'A Historical Sketch of S'aivism,' *The Cultural Heritage of India*, II, p. 29; cf. also C. Chakravarti, 'The Soma or Sauma sect of the S'aivas,' *I. H. Q.*, VIII, pp. 220-222.

(5) Āśrama, (6) Bāṇa, (7) Giri, (8) Araṇya, (9) Parvata, and (10) Sāgara. Their classification is made as follows: (1) Daṇḍī, (2) Saṁnyāsī, (3) Paramahaṁsa, (4) Brahmacārī, and (5) Gṛhastha Gosais. Many of these Śaṅkarite monks observe Śaiva practices.

The Sittars

The Sittars or Siddhas are a sect, which flourished in the Tāmiḷ land.[1] They held a monotheistic and Puritan creed and condemned ritual. The few hymns which they have left behind them tell us very little about this sect. Their main singers seem to have been Ahappey and Pambatti. Pattinattu Pillai wrote some fine lyrics. Tattuva Rāyar (17th cen. A.D.) wrote the *Adaṅgam Muṛai.* The Sittars denounce in their songs the most cherished beliefs of the masses. Many of their songs are included in the *Śiva-vākyam.* They mainly attribute their songs to famous sages of antiquity, namely, Agastya and his disciples. Barth observes that, 'in elevation of style they rival the most perfect compositions which have been left us by Tiruvalluvar, Auveiyār, and the ancient Tāmiḷ poets; that, at the same time in their severe monotheism, their contempt for the Vedas and Śāstras, their disgust at every idolatrous practice, and especially their repudiation of a doctrine so radical to Hinduism as metempsychosis, they much more clearly betray a foreign influence; and that they are imbued more with Christian ideas'.[2] The Sittars were 'zealous adepts' of alchemy.

Other Minor Sects

There are other minor Śaiva sects which 'practise the most severe self-tortures and privations.'[3] They are as follows: *Ūrdhva-bāhus*— These are ascetics with uplifted hands. The *Tharasris* are those who remain in a standing posture. The *Ūrdhva-mukhis* keep their heads hanging downwards, with feet attached to the bough of a tree. *The Pañcadhūnis* always keep themselves surrounded by fire during all the seasons. The *Jalāśayis* keep themselves under water during the day-time. The *Jaladhara-tāpasis* are those who 'keep themselves under a jet of water from sunset to sunrise'. The *Fararis* live on fruits alone. The *Dūdhahāris* live only on milk. The *Alumas* never eat salt. The *Kanipa Śaiva Yogīs* maintain themselves by the exhibition of their skill in managing snakes.[4] The *Nakhis* are of a less extravagant nature, being confined to the length of their nails, which they never cut. They live by begging, and wear the Śaiva marks[5]. The *Guḍaras* shout out 'Alakh' and carry about a pan of metal with them. In this pan they have a small fire for the purpose of burning scented woods at the house of the persons from whom they receive alms.[6] There are the other minor Śaiva sects, namely, *Rukharas, Sukharas, Ukharas, Kara-Liṅgīs,* and the naked *Śaiva Nāgas.* They are of minor importance, having arisen mainly on account of the difference in minor details.

---

1. Cf. also Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, Intro. pp. 127, 146, 2nd Ed.; E. Ch. Gover, *The Folk-songs of Southern India*, Madras, 1871.
2. Barth, *Religions of India*, p. 210 f.
3. Bhattacharya, *Castes and Sects*, p. 406.
4. *Ibid*, p. 405.
5. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 235.
6. *Ibid.*

PART V

THE SAIVA PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS

CHAPTER XV

EARLY MONOTHEISM

Natural Environments—The Three Periods of Vrātya Philosophy—Indus Valley Period—Ṛgvedic period.

I. INTRODUCTORY

In the wonderland of India Nature seems to have bestowed upon the people the rare gifts in the field of spiritualism. Radhakrishnan gives a graphic description of the natural environments in India. "The huge forests," says he, "with their wide leafy avenues afforded great opportunities for the devout soul to wander peacefully through them, dream strange dreams and burst forth into joyous songs. World-weary men go out on pilgrimages to these scenes of nature, acquire inward peace, listening to the rush of winds and torrents, the music of birds and leaves, and return whole of heart and fresh in spirit. It was in the *āśramas* and *tapovanas* or forest hermitages that the thinking men of India meditated on the deeper problem of existence."[1] But who were the originators of the early notions of Indian philosophy and asceticism?

The general opinion amongst scholars generally tended towards an Aryan origin of the various systems of Indian philosophy. But the recent Indus Valley discoveries have really created a new avenue of thought in the field of research. The marvellous ideas contained in the inscriptions and the various images and representations of Gods and Goddesses have really changed the outlook of scholarship. In fact they have thrown light on the early beginnings of Monotheism, the various doctrines of Yoga, Karma and Rebirth, asceticism, and many other allied problems which had remained almost unsolved till this day. A study of the gradual development of these ideas should be of an absorbing interest indeed!

II. THE THREE PERIODS

Proto-Indian Period

The whole history of the Śaiva philosophy can be divided into three periods, namely, (1) the Proto-Indian Period; (2) the Upaniṣadic Period; and finally, (3) the Religio-philosophic or the Āgamic Period. During the first period we find how the doctrine of Devotion (*Bhakti*) along with the basic principles of Indian philosophy were in a process of formation. The different proto-Indian representations and inscriptions clearly prove the existence of the idea of the superiority of God Śiva. Besides, the roots of the various doctrines of Yoga Karma and Rebirth, and asceticism can be traced to these ancient times.

1. Radhakrishnan. *History of Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 22.

Upanisadic Period

The second period runs from the time of the *Ṛgveda*, through the period of the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*, down to the period of the *Upaniṣads* and the *Gītā*. During this period one can observe how the early nature-worshipping Aryans gradually imbibed the notion of the Supreme Being Śiva of the Vrātyas, how they tried to introduce their doctrine of the pantheistic Brahman, and ultimately how they caused a fusion of the two e. g. Brahman and Śiva by mixing together the two doctrines of Pantheism and Monotheism. Again, the Aryans introduced the Vrātya system of the Yati-hood as a fourth *Āśrama*. They adopted and partly developed almost all the doctrines of Karma, Rebirth, Bhakti and asceticism. The most significant fact in regard to the intellectual activities of this period is that we perceive some of the sectarian influences at work both in the region of philosophy and religion. The Aryans, on the one hand, tried to adopt and assimilate the best that was in the Vrātya culture. The history of Vaiṣṇavism along with its doctrine of the *Avatāras* clearly indicates this tendency. The non-Aryan thinkers, on the other hand, tried to assert their intellectual independence by retaining the supreme position of Śiva-Rudra as the supreme God-head of the universe. The famous works, namely, the *Bhagavad-gītā* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, as well as the statements made in the various Upaniṣads regarding the early conflict between the Brāhmans and the Kṣatriyas clearly throw light on the above working of the two communities of the Aryans and the Vrātyas. Both the sects make use of the common terminologies and ideas current during the period e. g. Brahman, the doctrines of Sāṅkhya, Yoga, etc. The Viṣṇuites introduce the figures of Nārāyaṇa, Viṣṇu, and Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme God-head of the universe. *Mutatis mutandis* the Śaivas have Śiva-Rudra as their God-head. The main difference between these two schools, however, is that, whereas Vaiṣṇavism shows a greater inclination towards the adoption of the doctrine of Cāturvarṇya and the other phases of Aryan religion, Śaivism is still orthodox in its tendencies-a fact which can be seen from the various offshoots of the Vrātya religion e. g. the Āgamic, the Kāshmir, the Tāmiḷ and the Vīraśaiva systems.

Religio-Philosophic Period

Immediately after the writing of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, we enter into the precincts of a new era in the history of the non-Aryan religion. During this period the philosophy propounded in the *Gītā* was going on hand in hand with those of the Śaiva, Śākta, Buddhist, Jain and other religious systems in India. During the reigns of the emperors of the Maurya, Bhāraśiva, Vākāṭaka, Gupta, Cālukya, Pāṇḍya, Coḷa and other dynasties, or in the solitary periods of the kings e. g. Harṣa, Śaśāṅka and others, religion and art flourished. It was in this period that the *Pañcarātra-saṁhitās*, the Purāṇas, the *Nārada* and the *Śāṇḍilya Bhakti-sūtras*, the Tantras, the Āgamas, the Tāmiḷ Siddhānta works, and later on the works of the promulgators of the Trika system and Vīraśaivism, come into being. However, we propose to make a detailed survey of the development of the Vrātya philosophy since the proto-Indian period down to that of the beginnings of Vīraśaivism.

III. THE INDUS VALLEY PERIOD

A. Lang made rather a significant remark when he observed that, 'There is nothing antecedently improbable in the theory that the belief in one supreme God may

have prevailed in India from a very early period, even before the rise of Vedic polytheism, because it is not confined to races in a high stage of culture, and is not infrequently found among primitive peoples.'[1] We accept this remark with the reservation, namely, that the pre-Vedic civilization in India was not of a primitive or nomadic character, but that it contained qualities of a very high order.

As against the above view, almost all the scholars proposed that the first attempts towards laying a firm basis for t he early doctrine of Monotheism were made by the Ṛgvedic Aryans alone, and that this can be seen from the Ṛgvedic hymns devoted to Varuṇa. Interestingly enough, Hopkins also daringly stated that, 'And yet it is almost a pity to spend time to demonstrate that Varuṇa worship was not monotheistic originally. We gladly admit that, even if not a primitive monotheistic deity, Varuṇa yet is a god that belongs to a very old period of Hindu literature. And for a worship so antique, how noble is the idea, how exalted is the completed notion of him: Truly, the Hindus and Persians alone of Aryan mount nearest to the high level of Hebraic thought. For Varuṇa beside the loftiest figure in the Hellenic pantheon stands like a God beside the man.'[2] But the proto-Indian inscriptions and the various representations of the Supreme God (Śiva), have provided us with ample meterials, which, when read and studied along with the traditions recorded in later literature, throw light on the various aspects of the non-Aryan philosophy e. g. the early notions of Śiva as a monotheistic deity, Karma and Rebirth, Heaven, Revelation of God, and finally asceticism. All these ideas act as the basis of the future system of Indian philosophy. It is proposed to deal here with the philosophical teachings of the early non-Aryans.

(1) *Śiva: The Supreme Being.*

The Mohenjo Darians describe that Śiva is the Supreme Being and the absolute ruler of the universe: He is one, self-subsistent, the supreme God of all the Gods and Great. He is the Supreme Being of Life. He is omniscient and benevolent. He is the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. It should also be noted in this connection that the notion of pantheism was absolutely absent during the proto-Indian period. Moreover, unlike the Ṛgvedic bards, the inscriptions do not introduce any other Being who is superior or even equal to the personality of Śiva.

(2) *A Virtuous Life.*

The proto-Indian inscriptions relate that one should lead a virtuous life. One of the inscriptions states, 'Reaching the sky one who is fish-eyed is happy.'[3] As Father Heras has rightly observed, 'Now these inscriptions do not speak of Āṇ who is the supreme fish-eyed, for Āṇ cannot reach the sky or heaven, as he is always there. Therefore the inscriptions refer to persons who have become fish-eyed, and apparently only such persons may reach the sky. The limit of perfection in order to attain heaven is therefore to be fish-eyed, and since this is a perfection of Āṇ, to be fish-eyed seems to be equivalent to the imitation of Āṇ."[4]

1. A. Lang, *The Making of Religion*, London, 1898, Ch. ix ff.
2. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, p. 172.
3. Marshall, *M. D.*, No. 387.
4. Heras, 'Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People etc.,' *J. U. B.*, V, p. 29.

(3) *Bhakti* (Devotion).

There is a unique representation on one of the Mohenjo Daro seals. It depicts the scene of two persons (perhaps protected by the Nāgas) seated on either side of Śiva.[1] This probably indicates how the proto-Indians used to approach God as his devotees. There are also other representations which throw light on various other aspects in regard to worship and other problems.

(4) *Summum Bonum*.

The Mohenjo Darians had really attained a high state of civilization. Even so, they had made a marked progress in the region of philosophy. According to them the *summum bonum* of life consisted in the idea of reaching the world of God, the sky.[2] Father Heras rightly observes that, 'This is an idea similar to that of the Upaniṣads, according to which the soul after death goes to the moon, and if the judgment is favourable, it furthermore proceeds to the sun.'[3]

(5) *Early Asceticism*.

The most important contribution of the non-Aryan thinkers was in the region of asceticism. We have already observed how the order of the Yatis was of an indigenous origin in India. However, till recently, the general opinion among scholars was that the system of the four Āśramas was an innovation of the Aryans alone. Ranade summarizes the whole position thus: "As regards the existence of the Āśramas at the time of the Upaniṣads we learn from the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*[4] that those of the student and householder did definitely exist; while we have to conclude from other passages where one is advised "to leave the world as soon as one becomes weary of it", that the order of the recluses also did exist; and finally, from such Upaniṣads as the *Muṇḍaka* as well as the Saṁnyāsa elsewhere, that the order of the Saṁnyāsis came last and was the completion of the three previously mentioned. In the *Chāndogya* all the four are enumerated."[5]

The Mohenjo Daro inscriptions, on the other hand, have clearly revealed the fact that the proto-Indians practised asceticism. One of the inscriptions reads, "the learned Mīnas who dwell in the cave". Father Heras observes in this connection that, "cave-dwelling was not ordinary in those days, when beautifully brick-built houses were common. Learned Mīnas dwelling in caves could not but be ascetics."[7] These must be the same people who were designated as Yatis later on.

That the order of the Yatis was originally of a non-Aryan origin becomes evident from the spirit of enmity shown towards them during the Ṛgvedic period (cf. under Vrātya sects). Further the system of the Ekavrātya was in every way akin to that of the Yatis.

1. Cf. under Serpent (*Zoolatry*). 2. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 387.
3. Heras, '*An Historical Introduction etc.*' to '*The Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka*, p. XLI.
4. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, s. 15 (a).
5. Ranade, *Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*, p. 60.
6. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization*, III, 21.
7. Heras, 'An Historical introduction etc.' to *The Mystic Teachings of the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka*, p. XLI.

The Vedic Aryans being fully imbued with the spirit of sacerdotalism added the third Āśrama of the Vānaprastha, in which Agnihotra (fire-sacrifice) played an important role. Thus there were three Āśramas in all originally, for instance, Brahmacarya, Gṛhastha and Vānaprastha–the last being the development of the order of Munis or Vaikhānasas. But this state of affairs did not exist any longer. The Aryans had converted into Aryanism almost all the non-Aryan tribes. And as a consequence, they could not observe the policy of 'aloofness' in the case of the religious ideas of the land. Eventually, we find that during the Upaniṣadic period the system of the Yatis or Saṁnyāsa was added to the original three-fold Āśrama system of the Brāhmans.

Father Heras, while making a distinction between the Vānaprastha and Yati, rightly observes, "this third Āśrama is evidently of Aryan origin, for there the Vānaprastha is still continuing the performance of Vedic sacrifices; while Yati in the fourth Āśrama does not perform Vedic sacrifices. Now the asceticism practised in the Upaniṣads is precisely this sort of asceticism, which does not know of Vedic sacrifices. Hence it is not Aryan, and therefore, we may affirm that the true asceticism of India is of Dravidian origin."[1] For such a conclusion we get a definite corroboration from the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*. It relates that 'the wise men of old' (*Pūrve Vidvāṁsaḥ*) never performed the Agnihotra. 'These wise men of old' evidently belong to the Ṛgvedic period. They are the old Dravidian learned people who never performed the Agnihotra, because they did not know even its name'.[3] It is worth noting in this connection that the *Atharvaveda* declares that, 'it is ordained that the householder should perform the sacrifice only if the Vrātya permits it; otherwise not'. This necessarily indicates that the Vrātyas must have been non-sacrificers originally.[4]

(6) *Yoga*.

We have already observed that some of the seals represent Śiva as seated on a throne in a Yogic posture. The particular *āsana* in which he is seated connot be properly deciphered at this juncture. It is, however, worth noting that the close association of Yoga with Śiva shows that Yoga must have formed one of the modes of life for attaining the *summum bonum* of life.

That the Yoga was formerly practised by the followers of Śiva becomes evident from the description given in the famous Vrātya Book in the *Atharvaveda*. It is said, 'Of that Vrātya (there are) seven breaths, seven expirations (*apāna*), as 'upward, *prauḍha*, *abhyūḍha*, *vibhū*, *Yoni*, dear and unlimited.'[5] All these instances clearly indicate that the practice of Yoga must be of great antiquity.

In the earlier passages of the Brāhmaṇas there are indirect references in regard to the practice of Yoga. It is said, 'Prajāpati practised penance... and created beings, etc.' The *Atharvaveda* and the Upaniṣads like the *Maitrāyaṇi* and the *Śvetāśvatara* throw further light in this direction. But can we really trace there the origin of Yoga ?

1. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. XXXIX.
2. *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, II, II. 5; Heras, *op. cit.*, p. XXXIX.
3. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. XXXIX.
4. Cf. under *Vrātyas* (Part I).
5. *Atharvaveda*, XV, 15 ff.

As against the opinion of Gough[1] and Garbe,[2] who asserted that the Yoga system was borrowed from the aboriginal tribes, Keith emphatically stated that, 'It is unnecessary, therefore, to see in the Yoga practice any borrowing from the aboriginal tribes, though we need not doubt that these tribes practised similar rites and that their influence may have tended to maintain and develop Yoga to the extraordinary popularity which it has achieved in India.'[3] However, the opinion expressed by Keith seems to be rather far-fetched when we take into consideration all that has been observed by us above.

(7) *Karma.*

Sir S. Radhakrishnan very aptly observes that, 'the Law of Karman is the counter-part in the moral world of the physical law of uniformity. It is the law of the conservation of energy.'[4] The doctrine of Karman is for the first time beautifully enunciated in the following dialogue between Ārthabhāga and Yājñavalkya. Ārthabhāga asks Yājñavalkya · "O, Yājñavalkya, when man dies and his word returns to the fire, and his breath to the winds, and his eyes to the sun, and his understanding to the will of the moon, and his ears to the cardinal points, and his body to the earth, and the *Ātman* to the space, and his hairs to the herbs, and his nails to the trees, and his blood and semen to the water, what then remains of man?' Yājñavalkya replied, 'O Ārthabhāga, my dear, shake hands. Only both of us should understand this; and we must not speak of this here, in this assembly.' Then they retired from the place and discussed about the doctrine of Karman, the main purport of their talk being, 'And indeed man is reborn pure by pure deeds and is reborn sad (evil) by sad (evil) deeds.' But who were the originators of this new doctrine?

It was generally believed till now that the idea of *Ṛta* or moral order was for the first time propounded by the Ṛgvedic bards. But the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions clearly prove that the idea was originally prevalent amongst the proto-Indians. One of the inscriptions relates, "May the one who has Fish eyes when dying be happy."[6] In this connection Father Heras observes that, 'To have the Fish eyes means to have the eyes of God, and to work always with the knowledge of God.'[7] Thus it must be this idea alone that developed itself in the later Indian philosophical systems.

(8) *Rebirth.*

The enunciation of the doctrine of Karman directly brings us into the precincts of that of Rebirth. Keith observes that, 'the Upaniṣads do not show the doctrine of transmigration and the accompanying doctrine of pessimism; that transmigration proper is not clearly known to any Brāhmaṇa text, which only shows the origin of the

1. Gough, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 18-19.
2. Garbe, *Sāṅkhya Philosophie*, pp. 185-186.
3. Keith, *the Sāṅkhya System*, p. 54.
4. Radhakrishnan, *History of Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 244.
5. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, 17.
6. Heras, 'Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People etc.', *B. U. J.*, V. i, p. 28.
7. *Ibid.*

system; that the origin of the belief has been attributed to borrowing from aboriginal tribes,[1] it being a common view in primitive peoples that the spirits of their dead pass into other forms of life; that the moral tinge was given by Yājñavalkya, while its immediate precursor in the Brāhmaṇas is the dread of repeated death, which is expressed in the view that even after death, death may await the man who is not proficient in some ritual performances'.[2] He has further emphatically asserted, that it is indeed doubtful whether without such background we could explain the extraordinary success of the doctrine in winning the real and lasting adherence of the great mass of people in India.[3] Macdonell endorses this view-point.[4] Ranade, however, points out that such an interchange of ideas between the Aryans and the Dravidians need not have taken place at all. He says that, 'the real source of a belief in transmigration among any people, under certain circumstances lies in their own ethnopsychological development, and not in an unproven or unprovable inter-influence from one country to another; and that upon this fruitful hypothesis that one can see the upspringing and the continuance of the idea of transmigration among the Greeks from Homer downwards through Orpheus to Pythogoras in their own native land; and that it is upon the same hypothesis that one can see the development of the same idea among the Indian Aryans from the *Ṛgveda* through the Brāhmaṇas to the Upaniṣads, without invoking the aid of any unwarrantable influence from the aborigines of India.'[5] However, it must be said that the learned scholar has rather confused the issue rather than solving it. We have observed that immediately after the Ṛgvedic period a fusion of the Aryans and the original inhabitants of India begins to take place. Hence we can hardly keep the two factors distinct, namely, Aryan and non-Aryan. Evidently, we cannot find out a succinct history of the working of the Aryan mind alone in all the literature that follows the *Ṛgveda* (perhaps including the later portion of the *Ṛgveda* itself). Added to this, we find that the Mohenjo Darians propounded the doctrine of Rebirth, which must have evidently been made as their own by the Aryans later on. One of the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions reads, 'these are the eight dresses (bodies) of a man who has died seven times.'[6] The idea that a man has to undergo seven births is current both in Indian tradition and literature. However, the idea of a continuous series of births seems to have been developed by the Sāṅkhya, Buddhist and other philosophical systems later on.

IV. THE VEDIC PERIOD

Multiplicity of Gods—Creation—Their borrowings from the Vrātyas.

We have already observed how the proto-Indians had formed a definite notion regarding the three main philosophical entities, namely, God, world and the individual soul, and also a definite ethical back-ground upon which they could build the structure of their philosophical wisdom. But the period of the *Ṛgveda* produces before us another phase altogether. In fact, whereas the contribution of the Vrātyas mainly

1. Keith, *The Sāṅkhya System*, pp. 16 ff.
2. *Ibid*; A. E. Gough, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 20-25.
3. *Ibid*.
4. Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*.
5. Ranade, *Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*, pp. 146-47.
6. Marshall, *M.D.*, No. 393.

lay in the field of monotheism, the Ṛgvedic Aryans, in the absence of any belief in one Supreme Being, tried to develop the doctrine of pantheism—a doctrine which was absolutely foreign to India before. Eventually all the later working of the Aryans was mainly directed towards the ushering of this doctrine even at the cost of throwing into subordination the original doctrine of monotheism of the proto-Indians. Now let us study the main aspects of the philosophical teachings of the *Ṛgveda.*

Multiplicity of Gods

Though according to the opinion of many scholars the Vedic bards tried to depict in Varuṇa a monotheistic deity, still we find that their teachings were not free from the defects of the doctrine of Henotheism, or Kathenotheism as Max Müller would designate it. To a Vedic Aryan any God is supreme for the time being, let it be Indra, Varuṇa, Sūrya, Agni, etc.

Creation

Besides, one may very well perceive in this wonderful document of the Aryans, that the Aryans did not inculcate any one view-point regarding the creation of the universe. 'Here Indra is said to be the probable creator;[1] there Viṣṇu is supposed to be the cause of the creation;[2] in a third passage Bṛhaspati is described as the God who made the world just as a carpenter or a workman whosoever constructs any aircraft.[3] Perhaps, it is said, the world was generated from a father and mother, who may be heaven and earth.[4] The fire working upon the water may have been like the womb whence all things movable and immovable have originated.[5] One of the *Ṛṣis* states that only God Savitar knows whence the sea sprang up, and that no human person may ever be acquainted with the origin of the gifts generously distributed by Savitar.[6] Who will know what was the first thing created, heaven or earth, day or night?[7] "Being ignorant, I am asking the poets who possess wisdom, about what I do not know myself: who is the one, who, as uncreated, is giving support to these six spaces?" And the reply is that, 'such is the Sun, the heavenly Father who becomes one with the earth or Mother.'[8]

The Ṛgvedic people had also no fixed notions of life. They look absolutely with a materialistic view of life, their main prayer being for 'a beautiful and gentle wife,' male children, gold and kine.

Their borrowing from the early doctrine: But as the Aryans advanced into the interior of India, they tried to adopt and assimilate the main aspects of the Dravidian culture. The early doctrine of monotheism preached by the non-Aryans had had its own effect on their mind. As a consequence of which, we find that during the later period of the *Ṛgveda* Prajāpati alone is described as the Father and Creator of everything. The Ṛgvedic bards have expressed it with delight that, "He is the

1. *Ṛgveda*, VI. 47. 3-4.
2. *Ibid*, I, 154. 1.
3. *Ibid*, X, 72. 2.
4. *Ibid*, VII, 53. 2; I, 59. 2; 1, 85. 2, 4, 6.
5. *Ibid*, I, 115. 1; I, 160. 9; VI, 50. 7.
6. *Ibid*, X, 149. 2; V, 48. 5.
7. *Ibid*, I, 85. 1.
8. *Ibid*, I, 164. 6-8; cf. Heras, *op. cit.*, p. X, for the above question.

one called by different names by the poets (*Ekam sad Viprā bahudhā vadanti* [1]). Father Heras observes in this connection that, "this foreign unitarian influence combined with the multiplicity of Gods of the home doctrines was the cause of the final evolution in the theological thought of the *Ṛgveda*. Since all the forces and phenomena of nature were Gods and God was only one, it was but natural concluding that everything was one God. This was the first enunciation of the doctrine of pantheism, the *magna carta* of which is contained in the renowned *Puruṣa-sūkta* of the Maṇḍala 10."[2] It is also worth noting that the Ṛgvedic poets have used another expression, for instance, '*apām perum*.' This expression, which contains a very lofty philosophical idea, seems to be of Vrātya origin.[3] It means 'Lord of Waters'.

1. *Ṛgveda*, I. 164. 46.
2. *Ibid*, X, 90; Heras, *op. cit.*, p. XII.
3. Cf. *infra : Purāṇic Cosmogony.*

CHAPTER XVI

THE UPANIṢADIC PERIOD

Introductory—Makers of Early Religion—The S'vetāśvatara Upaniṣad—S'aivism in other Upaniṣads.

The post-Ṛgvedic period is co-terminus with that of a gradual process of Aryanization of the non-Aryan religion and philosophy. It is during this period that a full-fledged system of the Āśramas comes into existence, that a full-fledged system of Rebirth and Karma comes into being, and that a distinct basis of ethics is laid down. Moreover, the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga doctrines find a unique place in Indian philosophy. During this period again, the material forces of the early pantheism merge themselves into the doctrine of Cārvāka. In the end of the Upaniṣadic period the two so-called heterodox systems e.g. Buddhism and Jainism, come into being. They were really the off-shoots of the original non-Aryan system of the Vrātyas.

I

Makers of Early Religion

The Brāhmans of the Vedic period were mainly engrossed in sacerdotalism. They developed the doctrine of pantheism in a manner which would suit their own sacerdotal order. Eventually their efforts mainly lay towards turning 'sacrifice' into a World Principle. With this training and trend of mind, we may definitely say, that they could have hardly acted as the makers of the Upaniṣadic philosophy. Of course they did take part in the philosophical discussions and disquisitions which used to take place then. But who must have been the real initiators into this new province of philosophy ?

We have observed that the Mīnas, Ābhīras and other proto-Indian tribes were the main promoters of the early doctrine of monotheism. They enunciated the doctrine of Karma and Rebirth, and the principles of asceticism, Yoga, and Mokṣa or Salvation. The Yatis, the Vrātyas and later on the Arhants were the next non-Aryan ascetics who must have been mainly responsible for spreading this philosophical lore.

The main Upaniṣadic lore seems to have been the property of the proto-Indians originally. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* a story is narrated how Indra and Virocana went to Prajāpati for obtaining the knowledge of the Ātman, and how Virocana was satisfied with the mere knowledge of the likeness of the Ātman with the ornamented body. Then it is said, "Therefore even now here on earth they say of one who is not a giver, who is not a believer (*aśraddadhāna*), who is not a sacrificer, 'Oh ! devilish (*asura*) !' For such is the doctrine of Asuras (*Asura Upaniṣad*). They adorn the body (*śarīra*) of one deceased with what they have begged, with dress, with ornament, as they call it, for they think that thereby they will win yonder world."[1] The most important aspect of this story is that the Asuras or non-Aryans also must have been

1. *Chandogya Upaniṣad*, VII and VIII Khaṇḍa.

holding popular disquisitions during a period when the Aryan bards were still busy in developing their doctrine of pantheism. In fact, the word *Asura Upaniṣad* mentioned in the above passage fully indicates this.

Garbe proposes that, 'India owes its philosophical knowledge not to the Brāhmans but to the warriors, to the princes and the nobles and to the wisdom of the kings.'[1] Hertel endorses the same view-point.[2] Keith, on the other hand, proposes that, "The explanation becomes simple enough when we look at the Brahmaṇas and the *Rgveda*: there we find that kings are often mentioned as generous donors; that there are lists of the great kings who performed sacrifice, and who beyond all things gave fees to the priest, just as in historical times great kings like Puṣyamitra and Samudragupta boast of their offerings. It was clearly necessary for the priests who abandoned the doctrine of sacrifice to live: they, therefore, had to find patrons and they must accordingly, like their predecessors, the sacrificial priests, represent their teaching as worth large sums. As a king must sacrifice to give gifts, so he must at least understand, and take part in discussions, to give gifts, and the position of the kings might easily be wholly deduced from the needs of the priest....... But that the philosophy of the *Brāhmaṇas* as seen in the Upaniṣads is essentially the development of the philosophy of the Brāhmaṇas cannot reasonably be doubted." However, all these doctrines mainly originated among the Vrātyas of the land.[3] In fact it was only in the Upaniṣadic period that all these doctrines were made as their own by the Brāhmans. For such a conclusion we get sufficient corroboration from the Upaniṣads themselves.

There is every truth in the supposition that the true philosophical lore of the Upaniṣads was of the making of the Kṣatriyas and ultimately of the non-Aryans. The story of Aśvapati Kaikeya solving the problem of Ātman[4], the dialogue of Nārada and Sanatkumāra[5], the episode of Uddālaka Āruṇi and King Jaivali[6], and finally that of Gārgya Bālāki and Ajātaśatru[7]–wherein the Kṣatriyas alone claim to possess the knowledge of Ātman–all these really indicate the non-Brāhman origin of the theory of Ātman.

II

The Svetasvatara Upanisad

Introductory–Main achievements–Firm foundation for future systems–S'iva–S'akti element–Doctrine of Bhakti–Borrowing of Vaiṣṇavism–A sectarian document.

Introductory

The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* is a unique Śaiva document written by the sage Śvetāśvatara, who is called a great Pāśupata (Mahā-Pāśupata) in the Purāṇic literature. It has been already observed above how the early philosophy of the proto-Indians developed itself in the Ṛgvedic and post-Ṛgvedic period. Their early monotheistic traits were still retained in the Book

1. Garbe, *Beitraage Zur Indischen Kultur geschichte*, pp. 3 ff. (Berlin, 1903); cf. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, I, pp. 227-9 (Calcutta, 1927).
2. Hertel, I, XLI, 188.
3. Cf. *Infra*.
4. *Chāndogya*, 5, 11-24.
5. *Ibid*, VII, 1, 4.
6. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, VI, 2, 8.
7. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, II, 4; *Kauṣītaki*, 4, 9.

XIV of the *Atharvaveda*, which deals with the topic of the mystic glorification of the Ekavrātya, and describes him as the Supreme Lord and creator of the universe. It is further stated that all the gods of the Aryan pantheon are subordinate to him.

But after the writing of the Book on the Ekavrātya, we have seen how a definite effort was being made by the Brāhman thinkers to cause a fusion of the two doctrines of Monotheism, as preached by the Vrātyas, and Pantheism, which happened to be of their own creation. But the *Śvetāśvatara* and the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣads* rather stand apart in this regard, especially in view of the fact that they look as a continuation of the old Vrātya philosophy with, however, a few changes here and there.

Main Achievements.

Supreme God

The main achievement of the *Śvetāśvatara* lies in the fact, that, while refuting the various doctrines current in those times, it insists on the existence of the Deva (God), who is the same as Īśa, Īśāna, Rudra, Śiva and Maheśvara, as the first Principle, though the use of the common Upaniṣadic expression 'Brahman' is made to denote it every now and then. Besides, by way of retaining the older traditions in regard to the representations of Śiva, the *Śvetāśvatara* refers to the *Pratimā* of Rudra, and states that, 'there can be no likeness' (*Pratimā*) of him, whose name is great glory.'[1] The sixth Chapter deals with the theistic aspect of the Vrātya system. In general the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* looks like one single piece of poetry, wherein free vent is given to the devotional element in man.

Another important contribution of the *Śvetāśvatara* lies in the fact, that, it creates a firm foundation for the future Vrātya philosophical systems. The expression *Bhagavat* is for the first time used in connection with Rudra, and for the first time in Indian literature. The Sāṅkhya and Yoga are specifically mentioned as doctrines leading to liberation.

Again there are references to the *pāśa*,[2] or net,[3] and to God Śiva.[4] In our opinion, it is for the first time that an effort is adumbrated here to introduce the doctrine of Pati, Paśu and Pāśa, which are the common designations, in later Vrātya philosophical systems, of the Supreme Lord, the Individual Soul and Bondage respectively. This is not, however, the old doctrine of Śiva of the proto-Indian period; but this must be treated as an effort towards amalgamating the notions of the Aryans in regard to Paśupati with the old Vrātya system. As has been already observed, during the Mohenjo Daro period Śiva was supposed to be the Lord of animals, in the sense that the animals, of whom he must have been called the Lord, formed the Lañcchanas of the various tribes. Hence Śiva was the Lord of tribes, and not of the animals themselves as such. But this early connotation was misunderstood by the Aryans, and they introduced the name of Paśupati. Eventually, with the advent of the period of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, we begin to mark the appearance of philosophical terminologies like Paśu, Pāśa, etc.

1. *Śvetāśvatara Up.*, iv. 19.
2. *Ibid*, v. 13; i. 11; ii. 15.
3. *Ibid*, v. 3.
4. *Ibid*, v. 14.

Siva-Sakti

The *Śvetāśvatara* also forms the basis of the element of Śiva-Śakti, which becomes one of the chief tenets of the later Indian systems. It designates Śiva as Māyin. Māyā is also styled as Prakṛti, and he who uses the Māyā is called Maheśvara[1]. Thus there seems to be a clear indication of the idea that Śiva is the possessor of the Māyā, which also acts as the Prakṛti, the Creatrix of the universe. It is also worth noting that the passage seems to indicate that the existence of this Māyā is to be found in the Supreme Being. Later on this idea is found developed in the Vrātya systems. But Śaṅkara interpreted the expression in a different way altogether. According to him Māyā has no independent real existence as the Śakti aspect of Brahman, but Māyā is mere illusion. Śaṅkara propounds the doctrine of the sole reality of Brahman, there being nothing apart from him in the whole universe. But, with the exception of the Kashmir school, all the later Vrātya schools have maintained the reality of the Śakti aspect of Brahman or Śiva.

Bhakti

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has aptly observed that, 'The description of the god-head and of the final serenity are instinct with the glow of love and admiration, and the treatise ends with an expression of self-surrender to the God, who makes himself manifest in one's own intelligence. The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, therefore, stands at the door of the Bhakti school, and pours its loving adoration on Rudra-Śiva instead of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, as the *Bhagavad-Gītā* did in later times when the Bhakti doctrine was in full swing'.[2] The *Śvetāśvatara* introduces expressions like *Bhagavat*,[3] *prasāda*[4]-meaning Grace of the Lord, etc. Of special importance is the final verse of the Upaniṣad which declares that, 'in order that the truths must be told to a high-minded man who feels the highest devotion (Bhakti) for God and for his *Guru* as for God.' In our opinion, all this is but a continuation of the past teachings of the Vrātyas. Macnicol observes that, 'here for the first time in connection with Śaivism the claims of Bhakti-and implicitly the claims of theistic religion-are authoritatively affirmed'.[5] We have already observed above that the proto-Indian period has left clear traces of the doctrine of Bhakti as propounded then. And eventually there is nothing of the sort of a sudden rise here, as Macnicol seems to believe, when the author introduces the doctrine of devotion and that of God's revelation (*prasāda*). It is worth noting that all these terminologies are accepted by the later Vrātya systems.

Borrowings of Vaisnavism

It would be really an interesting study to know how much Vaiṣṇavism owes to the Vrātya religion. Along with many other things, the ideas regarding the doctrine of Bhakti, the designation of the Lord as 'Bhagavat', the introduction and later the subordination of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga, etc.-all these are borrowed by the Gītā and later Vaiṣṇava documents. Best of all, the expression 'Bhagavat' used in the *Śvetāśvatara* was appropriated by the Vaiṣṇavas, and their whole religion goes by the name of *Bhāgavata*

1. *S'vetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, iv, 9-10.
2. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (Collected Works, Vol. IV.), p. 157.
3. *S'vetāśvatara*, 3. 11.
4. *Ibid*, 3. 20.
5. Macnicol, *Indian Theism*, p. 163.

in the later period. So much so, that, the expression has lost its original connotation, and the word Bhāgavata has become almost equivalent to 'Vaiṣṇava' alone now-a-days. It should be noted in this connection, however, that Patañjali refers to the *Śiva-Bhāgavatas*.

A Sectarian Document

Thus the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* forms an excellent contribution, namely, as one recapitulating the past and at the same time laying a firm foundation for future Vrātya philosophical systems. Eventually, the Upaniṣad seems to be of a fully Vrātya character, in so far as it forms a continuation of the old doctrine of Śiva of the proto-Indians. No doubt it has also imbibed partly the doctrines of Brahman, the Sāṅkhya and others, but that is only as one step towards the reconstruction of the already existing philosophy of the Vrātyas. R. G. Bhandarkar contends that the Upaniṣad is of a non-sectarian character. "This treatise", says he, "contains the theism of the Upaniṣad period in its most mature form with a god distinctly personal at the centre. The attributes of the Supreme Soul are often given in very general terms, and he is referred to by the non-sectarian general name Deva, but as often that Deva is identified with Rudra, Śiva, Īśāna and Maheśvara, and his powers are spoken of as Īśānīs; but there is no indication whatever that these names have been given for the purpose of raising Rudra–Śiva to the Supreme God-head to the exclusion of another God. Names indicative of Rudra-Śiva appear to have been used, since he was invested with a personality perceived and acknowledged by all. This Upaniṣad, therefore, is not a sectarian treatise like others promulgated in later times, and is often quoted by Śaṅkarācārya, Rāmānuja and other writers of the different schools, and not by one school only"[1]. All this would have been correct and right, if we could assume with the learned *Savant* that all the later development of Śaivism originated in the early notions of the Vedic Rudra. But the finds at Mohenjo Daro and other sites have clarified this notion, and proved beyond doubt that an independent Monotheistic doctrine was propounded in that early period. In the light of this the Vedic Rudra looks like an absolutele different personality. Thus one can see from this, that there is nothing of the kind of an abrupt rise in the *Śvetāśvatara* when it promulgates the doctrine of a monotheistic God. Further the Purāṇas have specifically mentioned Śvetāśvatara as a Mahā-Pāśupata, a fact which proves beyond doubt that the Upaniṣad must have been a sectarian Pāśupata document. The mere fact that the Upaniṣad is freely quoted by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other writers should be no ground for assuming the Upaniṣad to be of a non-sectarian character.

Thus the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* forms a link between the past and the future of the Vrātya philosophy. It looks back towards the past, in so far as it draws inspiration even from the proto-Indian philosophical notions; and it probes deep into the future, so much so, that it forms the main basis of all the future Vrātya systems of philosophy. Nay, all the other theistic systems also build their edifices on the philosophical back-ground of this Upaniṣad. It is now proposed to deal here with the main tenets propounded in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.

---

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.*, p. 157.

II. THE MAIN TENETS

In the first Chapter, the author refutes all the existing schools of thought, namely, of those who hold that the First Cause is the Yonī, Time, or Nature, or Necessity, or Chance, or the Elements, or the Puruṣa, or the combination of all these, or the Ātman.

The *Śvetāśvatara* further advocates the doctrine of Triune Unity: In Brahman there is a triad (1.9). There are two unborn ones–the knowing (Lord) and the unknowing (individual soul), the omnipotent and the impotent. She (Prakṛti) too is unborn, who is connected with the enjoyer and objects of enjoyment. Now, the soul (*ātman*) is infinite, universal, and inactive. What is perishable, is Primary Matter (Pradhāna). What is immortal and imperishable, is Hara. Over both perishable and the soul the one God rules (1.10). That eternal should be known as present in the self (*ātmasaṁstha*). There is nothing higher than that to be known. One recogniser the triune unity of the enjoyer, the object of enjoyment, and the universal actuator. This is the three-fold Brahman (1.12). That God faces all the quarters of heaven. Aforetime He was born, and He is within the womb. He has been born forth. He will be born. He stands opposite creatures, having his face in all directions (2.16). The God who is in fire, who is in water, who has entered into the whole world, who is in plants, who is in trees–to that God be adoration (2.17).

One God Rudra

Here is a clear identification of the one Supreme God Rudra. It is stated, that the one spreader of the net, who rules all the worlds with his ruling powers, the one who alone stands in their arising and in their continued existence-they, who know that, become immortal (3.1). Rudra is the one–He stands not for a second–who rules all the worlds with his ruling powers. He stands behind all persons, and after having created all the worlds, He, the protector, rolls it up at the end of time (3.2). Having an eye on every side and a face on every side, having an arm on every side, the one God forges together with hands, with wings, creating the heaven and the earth (3.3). He is the source and origin of the Gods, the ruler of all, Rudra, the Great Seer, who of old created the Golden Germ (Hiraṇya-garbha) (3.4). Rudra's form is Kindly (Śiva), unterrifying, revealing no evil.

Rudra and Brahman

Mostly being influenced by the doctrine of Brahman, who is no other than Rudra–Śiva here, the poet tries to describe Him: Higher than this is Brahman. The Supreme, the Great, hidden in all things, body by body, the one embracer of the universe—by knowing Him as Lord (Īśa) men become immortal (3.7). He is the mighty person of the colour of the Sun, beyond darkness (3.8). Than whom there is nothing smaller, nothing greater, the One stands like a tree established in heaven, by Him, the Person, this whole world is filled (3.9). That which is beyond this world is without form and without ill. (3.10).

Again, the poet describes the all-pervading characteristic of God. He is the face, the head, the neck of all, He dwells in the heart of all things. He is all-pervading and Bountiful (*Maghavan*), Omnipresent, and Śiva (3.11). Almighty Lord is the Person, the investigator of the Highest Being (Sattva) unto the purest attainment, the

ruler and shelter of all (3.17.). Men call Him the great Primeval Person (3.19). He is present in everything through immanence. The expounders of Brahman (Brahma-vādin) speak of Him as eternal (3.21).

Siva-Sakti

Further the poet describes how the manifold world is created through the Śakti of Īśvara (Śakti-yoga). The One who, Himself without colour, by the manifested application of his power (Śakti-yoga) distributes many colours in his hidden purpose, and into whom, its end and its beginning, the whole world dissolves. He is God *Deva*. However, here is a slightly pantheistic touch given: 'Having no beginning, thou dost abide with immanence, wherefrom all beings are born' (iv. 2, 3, 4).

The fourth Chapter gives a graphic description of Rudra as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the Universe. He is the One, who rules over every single source, in whom this whole world comes together and dissolves, the Lord (Īśāna), the Blessing-giver, God (Deva), adorable (4.10). He is the source and origin of the Gods, the ruler of all, Rudra, the Great Seer, who beheld the Golden Germ (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) when He was born (4.12). He is the Creator of all, of manifold forms, the one Embracer of the universe–by knowing Him as Śiva one attains peace for ever (4.14). He is indeed the protector of the world in time, the Overlord of all, hidden in all things, with whom the seers of Brahman and the divinities are joined in union (4.15). He is hidden in all things, exceedingly fine, like the cream that is finer than butter, the one Embracer of the universe, the Deva (4.17). That God, the All-worker, the Great Soul (Mahātman), ever seated in the heart of creatures, is framed by the heart, by the thought, by the mind (4.17).

The author gives a finer description of the abode of Śiva. He says, 'when there is no darkness, then there is no day nor night, nor being, nor non-being, only the Śiva is there. That is the imperishable, that is the desirable (splendour) of the Sun (Savitṛ). And from that was primeval intelligence (prajñā) created (4.18). Not above, not across, nor in the middle has one grasped Him. There is no likeness of Him whose name is Great Glory (Mahyaśas) (4.19). Nobody sees Him with the eye (4.20). He abides in the heart (ibid.).

Image of Rudra

The author seems to refer to the image of Rudra, when he says that, 'He is the eternal: a certain one in fear approaches. O Rudra! that face of thine which is propitious–with that thou protectest me forever' (4.21).

God and World

The fifth Chapter details the relation between Brahman and the manifold world. In the imperishable, infinite, Supreme Brahman are two things, for therein are knowledge and ignorance placed hidden. Ignorance is perishable, knowledge is imperishable; and there is another who rules over knowledge and ignorance (5.1). Kapila, as he was born, was being fed with knowledge by Him, who presides over every productive energy (5.2). Giving various forms to each group, the God resolves everything into the original principle. Creating again the Lord of Beings, He, the Great Soul, the Ruler, wields Sovereignty over all (5.3). As the Sun illuminates all quarters, upper and lower and transversal, so also the God,

the Bhagavat presides over the natures of all productive energies (5.4). The original cause of the world makes natural powers develop, and brings to a mature condition those who are capable of development. He presides over this universe and puts into operation all the qualities (5.5). That origin of Brahman Brahmadeva knows (5.6).

God and Individual Soul

The author next describes the individual soul. The individual soul is the Lord of the vital airs, who performs actions and enjoys or suffers that fruit, possesses three qualities and follows three ways, and goes through a succession of births in consequence of his actions (5.7). He is as big as thumb, bright like the Sun, is conscious of himself and wills, is as minute as the hundredth part of the point of a hair, and is endless. In himself he is not a female nor a male nor a sexless. This depends on the body assumed by him (58, 9, 10). He assumes many gross and subtle forms in accordance with his qualities of his actions and of the self. But He who effects the union, is another (5.12). Śiva, the God, the creator and destroyer, is said to be knowable by faith (*Bhāva*), love or the pure heart (5.14).

Rudra as a Theistic Deity

The author describes that, He promotes virtue and dispels sin. (He) should be known as existing in one-self (6.11). The One God is concealed in all beings, is all-pervading, the internal soul of all beings, presiding over all actions, the support of all beings, the witness of all, the life-giver, absolute and without qualities (6.12). He is the constant among the inconstant, the intelligent among intelligences, and the one among many. He grants desires (6.13).

Abode of God

As if in his moments of poetic ecstacy, the poet gives a very fine description of the abode of God. 'The Sun shines not there, nor the Moon and stars, these lightnings shine not, much less this (earthly) fire. After Him as He shines, doth everything shine. This whole world is illuminated by His light (6.14). The one soul (Haṁsa) resides in the midst of the soul (6.15). He is the ruler of Primary Matter (Pradhāna), and of the spirit (Kṣetrajña), the Lord of qualities (guṇa), the cause of transmigration (saṁsāra) and of liberation (mokṣa), of continuance and of bondage (6.16). Consisting of that immortal as the Lord, intelligent, omnipotent, the Guardian of this world, is He who constantly rules this world. There is no other cause found for ruling (6.17).

Doctrine of Maya

The poet introduces the expressions *Māyin* and *Māyā*. He says that the whole world the illusion-maker (Māyin) projects out of this (Brahman). And in it by illusion (Māyā) the other is confined (4.9). Further, he relates the inter-relation between Prakrti, Māyā, and Maheśvara. Nature (Prakṛti) is illusion (Māyā), and the mighty Lord (Maheśvara) is the illusion-maker (Māyin). This whole world is pervaded with beings that are part of Him (4.10). We have already discussed the problem about the importance of this statement.

Salvation

Śvetāśvatara deals with the problems connected with salvation and the observance of the various modes of attaining it. He says: By meditating on Him, by union with Him, and by entering into His Being more and more, there is finally cessation from every illusion (*māyā-nivṛtti*)

(1.10). By knowing God (Deva), there is a falling off of fetters; with distresses destroyed, there is a cessation of birth and death. By meditating upon Him there is a third stage at the dissolution of the body, even universal Lordship; being absolute (*Kēvala*), his desire is satisfied (1.11). There is nothing higher to be known. By reaching His abode one attains peace (śānti) (cf. 4.9).

As an illustration, the poet describes: Two birds, fast bound companions, clasp close the self-same tree. Of these two, the one eats sweet fruit; the other looks on without eating (4.6). On the self-same tree a person, sunken, grieves for his impotence, deluded; when he sees the other, the Lord (Īśa) contented, and His greatness, he becomes freed from sorrow (4.7). The same stanzas also occur in the *Ṛgveda* (I. 164.20) and the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (VII. 1.1).

The Sankhya And Yoga

The author emphatically states that, 'One attains the cause by Sāṅkhya and Yoga (6.13).' The author also refers to the name of Kapila (5.2). He further describes the peculiar way in which the creation takes place: With the one unborn female, red, white and black, who produces many creatures like herself, there lies the one unborn male taking delight. Another unborn male leaves her with whom he has had delight (4.9).

The author seems to possess a keen knowledge of Yoga. The second Adhyāya details some practices of Yoga. Even as mirror stained by dust shines brilliantly when it has been cleansed, so the embodied one, on seeing the nature of the Soul (Ātman), becomes unitary, his end attained, and from sorrow freed (2.14). When with the nature of the self, as with a lamp, a practiser of Yoga beholds the nature of Brahman, unborn, steadfast, from every nature free–by knowing God (Deva), one is released from all fetters (2.15). There are also other passages which describe this point in detail.

God's Grace

In Chapter III the poet lays stress on the point that through the Grace (*prasāda*) of the creator one can see the Lord Īśa and His greatness (3.20). Further, Śvetāśvatara expresses that, 'by the efficiency of his austerity and by the grace of God (Deva–prasāda) the wise Śvetāśvatara, in proper manner, declared Brahman unto the ascetics of the most advanced stage as the supreme means of purification–this which is well-pleasing to the company of seers.

Conditions for receiving Knowledge.

Śvetāśvatara expresses very beautifully that the supreme mystery in the Vedānta, which has been declared in the former time should not be given to one (who is) not tranquil, nor again to one who is not a son nor a pupil. These matters become manifest to him who has the highest devotion (Bhakti) for God, and for his spiritual teacher (Guru) even as for God, and (if he be) a great soul (*Mahātman*) (6.22).

III

Saivism in other Upanisads

There are also some other Upaniṣads which introduce Śiva as a philosophical entity. We have already discussed about the problem of the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad*

(cf. Part IV). The *Praśna* (V) and *Māṇḍukya* (1 and 2) *Upaniṣads* speak of the meditation of the syllable 'Om'. The *Maitreya Upaniṣad* describes that, 'the body is the temple and the *Jīva* (individual soul) is clearly the 'One' Śiva.'[1] Further there are other sectarian Upaniṣads which are based on the Vedāntic standpoint. The *Brahma* introduces all the three gods by stating that the Brahman is four-fold (Catuṣpād–lit. four-footed), namely, the states of wakefulness, dream, deep-sleep and lastly Turīya, which are represented by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, and the last being *akṣaram*.[2] Next follow the *Jābāla*, *Nīlarudra* and the *Kaivalya Upaniṣads*. The *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* says.

'He is Brahmā, he is Śiva, he is Indra, he is undecaying, supreme self-resplendent, he is Viṣṇu, he is breath, he is the spirit, the Supreme Lord, he is all that has been or that shall be eternal.'

The *Nīlarudra Upaniṣad* describes the soul:

' I formed of earth (Pṛthivīmayaḥ) behold descending from the sky, that blue-necked Rudra'.

The *Pañcabrahma Upaniṣad* (20) states:

'In this city of Brahman (body), there is, O sage, a small lotus-like house. In the centre of it there is a subtle ether. He is Śiva, *Sat-cid-ānanda*. He should be sought after by those desirous of salvation.'

1. Schrader, *Minor Upaniṣads*, I, p. 113
2. *Ibid.* pp. 82–83.

CHAPTER XVII

PURĀṆIC ŚAIVISM

Purāṇic Cosmogony—Vedāntic S'aivism.

The Purāṇas are really the most marvellous documents containing data in regard to almost all the branches of Indian culture. Eventually they have thrown a flood of light on the early history of Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Śāktism, and other philosophical systems in ancient and medieval India. Especially, in the case of Śaivism we find that they deal with it in its two different aspects, namely, those of the Āgamic and Vedāntic. The teachings of Śaṅkara seem to have had an abiding effect on the minds of some of the followers of Śaivism also. And hence we come across many a passage in the Purāṇas with a tinge of pantheism here and there given to the early Śaiva doctrines. We have already observed before how the Purāṇas have made a mention of the Āgamic and other systems of philosophy. It is proposed to deal here with some other kindred problems, namely, those of the Purāṇic Cosmogony and the Vedāntic Śaivism.

I. PURANIC COSMOGONY

The problem of Purāṇic cosmogony is of an absorbing interest. The Purāṇas, being the carriers of tradition from far ancient times, naturally contain various theories of creation whose origin can be traced to the proto-Indian period. They inculcate various kinds of theories, and one would feel bewildered to find that they have assumed any kind of shape at the hands of the Purāṇic authors. Moreover, as the Purāṇas have been handled by the followers of different sects, the cosmogonic theories also have been stamped by these sectarian influences. Once, the unmanifest (*avyakta*) happens to be the Supreme Being; on another occasion, it is Brahmā; on the third Viṣṇu Nārāyaṇa, the Lord of the Waters; and finally, it is Śiva, who is described to have created the universe. Added to it, the Purāṇas generally give a long list of the various beings created: the seven or nine Brahmāṇas and their progeny (which include the Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, and Gandharvas also), the various worlds (Lokas), etc. We shall now deal with the problem of the various theories propounded in the Purāṇic writings.

The Various Theories.

The Purāṇic theories of creation may be enumerated as follows:

(1) That the Lord is the Supreme Being of the universe, the waters either preceding Him or coeval with Him;

(2) That the whole world including Brahmā, or Brahmā and others are produced out of the primeval egg;

(3) That the whole world is created at the instance of the Duality of Sex; and finally,

(4) That one of the Gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu or Śiva is the main creator of the universe.

We shall summarize them briefly.

(1) There are many stories related in which the Supreme Being himself creates the world or that the waters precede immediately before he is created. The *Brahma Purāṇa*[1] describes that God created the world as follows:—'He first created the waters which are called Nārā, and that they are the sons of Nara. Therefore he is called Nārāyaṇa. (Further), that semen grew itself into a golden egg from which Brahmā was born of his own accord—on account of which he is called Svaymbhū. Brahmā divided the egg into two halves, which acted as heaven and earth.' The *Brahmāṇḍa* narrates that Brahmā, known as Nārāyaṇa, slept on the surface of the ocean[2]. The *Vāmana* describes that, when all the movable and immovable things were destroyed, it was all a terrible state (of affairs) with the ocean alone (existing). Further there was a golden egg, which possessed the capacity to create the beings. Brahmā was born out of it, and he created this world out of the three qualities (Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas)[3]. The *Viṣṇudharmottara P.* relates that Viṣṇu created the waters, and that the creation of the egg and Brahmā took place afterwards[4]. The *Agni P.* details that the waters were created first; that Nārāyaṇa was lying on the (surface of) waters; and that Brahmā was born afterwards, and created the whole world.[5] The *Liṅga* relates that, as Brahmā slept on the lone ocean in the night-time, when all the movables and immovables were destroyed, he is called Nārāyaṇa[6]. The *Mārkaṇḍeya* details that Brahmā is of four kinds on account of his being Saguṇa and Nirguṇa. The first three stages comprise the three Guṇas. The last stage consists of the lying of the serpent amidst waters[7].

(2) *Egg Theory.* We have already given some examples, according to which the egg is always produced after the creation of waters. But some of the Purāṇas describe the production of the egg rather independently. The *Padma* narrates that Viṣṇu was born from the indescribable, and then the production and creation of the egg and Brahmā respectively took place[8].

(3) *Duality of Sex.* Some of the Purāṇas narrate the version of the creation of the world from the duality of sex *i. e.* from the union of the male and the female principles. The *Brahmāṇḍa* describes that originally there were only Puruṣa and Prakṛti: and with the contact of Prakṛti, Brahmā became three-fold[9]. The *Bhāgavata* states that God Viṣṇu having entered into his own Māyā, became the creator, preserver, and destroyer of the universe.[10] The *Brahmāṇḍa* (*Pūrva-bhāga*) describes that Brahmā divided himself into two and then created the world. With the one half he became the male (Puruṣa) and from the other, the female Śatarūpā was born[11].

---

1. *Brahma Purāṇa, Pūrva-bhāga, Pra. Pā.* 1,38 ff.
2. *Brahmāṇḍa P., Prathama-pāda*, 1, Adh. 4. Here Brahmā divides himself into three parts. It says: नराणामयनं यस्मात्तेन नारायणः स्मृतः ।
3. *Vāmana P.*, Adh. 43,17 ff.
4. *Viṣṇudharmottara P., Prathama Kha*, Adh. 2.
5. *Agni P.*, 17.7.
6. *Liṅga P., Pūrva-bhāga*, 4,58.
7. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 4,50.
8. *Padma*, 5 *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa*.
9. *Brahmāṇḍa, Madhyama-kha.*, Adh. 31.
10. *Bhāgavata P.*, 4,7,50 ff.
11. *Brahmāṇḍa, Pūrva-bhāga*, Adh. 9.

The *Śiva P.* narrates an account wherein Śiva says, 'You two, Brahmā and Viṣṇu were born from my Prakṛti-from my right and left sides'[1]. The *Liṅga* gives an intere ting account. Māyā says that, 'the seed arising from the Liṅga was (thrown) into my Yonī, and an egg was produced out of it. And it was placed or situated into the waters for a thousand years. It was divided through the force of the wind into two halves. Brahmā and the whole world were created out of it'.[2]

(4) *Personalistic Theory.* The Purāṇas have forwarded various Personalistic theories of creation. In them the whole creation is due to a single person or personality and that person is generally Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Rudra or Śiva. The *Brahmavaivarta* states that Brahmā created the world.[3] The *Varāha* describes that Prajāpati was born from the finger of the right hand, and that he created the world.[4] The *Padma* states that Viṣṇu is the first of the three (*Tri-prathamam*).[5] The *Garuḍa* describes that Viṣṇu becomes all the three e.g. Brahmā, Rudra and Hari.[6] The *Bhaviṣya* states that, 'when everywhere there had pervaded darkness, the only Rudra created mind, Ahaṅkāra, the ten Mahābhūtas, eight Prakṛtis, sixteen Vikāras, and then Viṣṇu and Brahmā.'[7] The *Harivaṁśa* narrates that Nārāyaṇa created Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Suras, Nāgas, Gandharvas, Rākṣasas, etc. who were all located in the egg.[8] The *Mārkaṇḍeya* states that Brahmā created the whole world, the nine Brahmāṇas, etc.[9] We have not, however, given all the other details of these theories.

Earlier Accounts.

If we now take a survey of all the older accounts of creation, we find that the Purāṇic theories exist there in one form or the other. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,[10] the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*,[11] the *Manusmṛti* and other texts describe that waters alone existed first. The theory of the golden egg has become popular since the time of the writing of the *Puruṣa-sūkta* [12] (e.g. Golden Embryo instead of the golden egg); and it has been adopted by the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[13] (i.e. after the waters were created), the *Chandogya*, [14] etc. The story of the creation out of the duality of sex is related in the *Praśna* [15] (where Rajī and Prāṇa were first created), the *Taittirīya*, [16] in the Sāṅkhya system, and some other later works. The Personalistic theory of creation is narrated in the early Vedic, Brāhmaṇic and other literature (cf. *Supra*). The *Atharvaveda* describes that God Mahādeva is the Supreme Being of the universe (cf. under Vrātyas). The *Śvetāśvatara* gives a succinct account of creation by saying that Śiva is the Supreme Being of the universe.

1. *Śiva P. Rudrasaṁhitā* 3, *Khaṇḍa* 1, Adh. 9. 16 ff.
2. *Liṅga, Pūrvārdha*, Adh. 38.
3. *Brahmavaivarta, Brahmakhaṇḍa*, Adh. 7 ff.
4. *Varāha P.*, 2, 46 ff.
5. *Padma*, 5, Adh. 14, 130.
6. *Garuḍa, Prathamāṁśa*, Adh. 4.
7. *Bhaviṣya*, cf. Supra.
8. *Harivaṁśa, P.* 3, 7 ff.
9. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, Adh. 45 ff.
10. *Śatapatha Brā.*, vi. 1. 1.
11. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, v. 5. 1.
12. *Ṛgveda*, x, 90.
13. *S'atapatha Brā.*, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*
14. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, iii. 15. 1.
15. *Praśna Up.*, i. 3. 13.
16. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, ii. 6.

Their Nature.

We have already seen that the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions describe that Śiva is the Supreme Being of the universe. Moreover, the idea of Ardhanārīśvara (*ammān*) was in vogue then. Eventually, after the immigration of the Aryans, the main theory of creation must not have been properly understood by the Aryans, whose main ∝p×η of the universe was the sacrifice. Hence, they must have put forth the various theories after partly borrowing the doctrines of the proto-Indians. We have two instances at least of such borrowing. Firstly, all the theories in regard to the creation of the universe from the two male and female Principles may be solely due to the currency of the idea of Ardhanārīśvara though the term does not seem to have connoted the same sense originally. The other instance is that of the creation of the waters. The Purāṇas and the *Mahābhārata* narrate emphatically that Nārāyaṇa so obtained his name on account of his lying on waters. The expression Nārā in the word Nārāyaṇa, which first occurs in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, is of purely Vrātya origin. The word must have been derived from the Dravidian word '*Nīr*'[1]. The close association of the snake with water and later with Nārāyaṇa, clearly indicates the correctness of such a view. Nay even the *Ṛgveda* supports such a theory. To quote the Ṛgvedic stanza itself:

> "We bring the stay of Life (Jīvadhanyam),
> who protects the waters (*Apām Pērum*), swift-
> hearing, friend of Gods, who waits on sacrifice."[2]

The expression '*Apām Pērum*' is very significant here. Griffith translates it as, 'who makes the waters swell.' Ludwig interprets it as meaning 'drinker of waters', and says that Soma is meant there. Sāyaṇa rightly interprets it as meaning 'protector' and the expression '*Jīvadhanyam*' as 'the great souls residing in him."[4] Now the word 'Pērum' is really of Vrātya origin, it being derived from the root 'Pēr.' The word 'Pērumal' is current as meaning 'Overlord' or Śiva. Then, who must be this Lord of Waters? The identification is clear enough, namely, that it must be the God of the proto-Indians.

II. VEDANTIC SAIVISM IN THE PURANAS

It has already been observed how Śaivism divided itself into two branches, the first consisting of a partly Vedāntic system and the second of the Āgamic. Some of the sectarian Upaniṣads preach that there is nothing apart from Śiva in the whole universe. Even so, many of the Purāṇas inculcate that Śiva alone is the Supreme Being—and that the world and souls are identical with Him–they having no independent existence for themselves. The doctrine of Māyā as propounded by Śaṅkara is introduced in many of the Purāṇic Chapters. Many of the Śaiva passages accept the principles of the Sāṅkhya system and enunciate the twenty-six principles. They also try to introduce the main tenets of Śaivism by adding the Pāśupata-Yoga to the whole system. The *Īśvaragītā* in the *Kūrma Purāṇa* may be cited as an instance.

1. Kittel's *Kanarese-English Dictionary*, *Intro.* p. xxxvi.
2. *Ṛgveda*, x. 36. 8.
3. *Sāyaṇa*: उदकानां पेरं पालकं - जीवधन्यं. धन्या जीवा यस्मिन्नसौ जीवधन्य: ।

CHAPTER XVIII

THE ĀGAMIC SCHOOLS

Introductory—Āgamic S'aivism—Tāmiḷ or Siddhānta S'aivism—The Trika System—Vīraśaivism.

I

The Various Schools

Introductory

Immediately after the writing of the *Śvetāśvatara* and ***Atharvaśiras Upaniṣads***, we find the emergence of the various schools of Śaiva philosophy. The *Śvetāśvatara* gave a new impetus to the Śaiva school of thought by the introduction of a new terminology (Pati, Paśu, etc.), and the doctrines of Śiva-Śakti, the Sāṅkhya, Yoga and others. All these form part and parcel of the later systems of Śaiva philosophy. Again, like the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* all these doctrines make a distinction between the higher and the lower (*para* and *apara*) forms or the transcendental and empirical aspects of Brahman (*Pāramārthika* and *Vyāvahārika.*) Side by side with these later Āgamic schools the Purāṇas also have dealt with the problem of the Vedāntic and Āgamic Śaivism. Farquhar has grouped together all the later Śaiva systems under the title of Āgamic Śaivism: (1) The Sanskrit School of Śaiva Siddhānta; (2) the Tāmiḷ School; (3) the Kāshmīr School; and finally, (4) the Vīraśaiva School.[1] All these schools with slight variations preach the teachings of the Āgamic system.

The Trika system of Kashmir, though it mainly agrees in regard to the main problems propounded in the Āgamas, follows the doctrine of Śaṅkara in regard to the identity and oneness of Brahman, the individual souls and the world. All the other schools are monotheistic in their trend of thought. Farquhar makes a distinction between the Sanskrit and the Tāmiḷ school. He observes, 'The Sanskrit school has in the main a following of Brāhmans, many of them being temple-ministrants, its Vedāntic standpoint is Viśiṣṭādvaita and its literature is in Sanskrit; while the following of the Tāmiḷ school is almost entirely non-Brāhman, its Vedāntic standpoint is Advaita, or according to other writers, Bhedābhēda.'[2] But we are not in a position to agree with this learned scholar on two grounds, namely, (1) that the philosophy propounded by both these schools is more or less the same (cf. *infra*), and secondly, (2) that the followers of the Tāmiḷ school contain the names of some prominent Brāhmans also.

Gopinatha Rao has made a distinction between the Āgamic and the Vedāntic Śaivas as follows: 'The Vedāntic Śaivas consider the Vedas to be the supreme writings, whereas the Āgamāntins consider the Vedas as inferior to the Āgamas; for they assert

1. Farquhar, *O R L I*, p. 191.
2. *Ibid*, p. 255.

that the former came out of Śiva as unconsciously as his breath, whereas the twenty-eight Āgamas were personally and consciously dictated by Śiva. They further treat the Advaitins and the Mīmāṁsakas as *paśus* or unevolved souls and to be therefore unfit for receiving *Śaivadīkṣās* or initiations. Secondly, the Vaidikas treat the Āgamāntins as being heterodox. Kumārila-Bhaṭṭa classes them among atheists, and Amarasiṁha classing Devalas, who are generally the Pāśupatas, the Pāñcarātras and other Tāntrikas that are addicted to image worship, among Śūdras[1]. Thirdly, their system of Dīkṣā, Aṅkurārpaṇa with which the ceremonies are begun, the philosophy of Saḍadhvas, and many others are not found in the Vaidic religions and therefore mark off Āgamānta as being different in essentials from the Vaidic religion. Fourthly, unlike the Vedāntins, the Āgamāntins do not shut out women, Śūdras, and the Pratilomas from participating in religious rites and ceremonies. They freely allow women to meditate upon the Pañcākṣara-mantra, and grant Dīkṣā to Śūdras, who might in their turn give Dīkṣā to others among them.'[2] However, we find that attempts were being made later on to minimise the differences between the two schools as the instances of Śrīkaṇṭha-Śivācārya and Āppayya Dīkṣita may show.

II

The Agamic System

Introductory—Literature—Āgamas in Literature—Their Date—The Āgamic System.

Introductory

As the Vedas form the scriptures of the Vaidikas, or the *Pāñcarātra-Saṁhitās* of the Vaiṣṇavas, so the Āgamas, which are attributed to the authorship of Śiva, formed the holy writings of the non-Vedic Śaivas in general. Woodroffe and some other writers have tried to apply the term Āgama to the religious literature of all the Śāktas, Vaiṣṇavas, and Śaivas. Still the term generally indicates the orthodox religious works in Sanskrit of the Śaivas alone. The doctrine propounded in the Āgamas is more akin to that of the Tāmiḷ Siddhānta system.

As has been observed above, the *Kūrma Purāṇa* makes a distinction between the Vaidic and the non-Vaidic Āgamas. In like manner, the *Sanatkumāra-Saṁhitā* also says that the Śivāgama is two-fold on account of its being *Śrauta* and *Aśrauta*. The Śrauta is sub-divided into two i.e. independent (*svatantra*) and the other (*itara*). The former consisted of ten and the latter of eighteen, and is called Siddhānta. The other is said to have consisted of one crore writings.[3]

Literature

The traditional account of the Āgamas is that there are twenty-eight Āgamas and 108 Upāgamas. All the Āgamas and Upāgamas have not still become available.

1. *Amarakośa*, *Kāṇḍa* II, *S'ūdravarga*.
2. Gopinatha Rao, *EHI.*, II, i, pp.6 ff.
3. Cf. Woodroffe, *S. S.*, p. 52; cf. also *Vāyu-Saṁhitā*, i. 28.

The names of the main twenty-eight Āgamas may be mentioned as follows:

(1) *Śaivic: Kāmika, Yogaja, Cintya, Kāraṇa, Ajita, Dīpta, Sūkṣma, Sahasra, Aṁśumān, and Suprabha or Suprabheda.*

(2) *Raudric: Vijaya, Niśvāsa, Svāyambhuva, Āgneyaka, Bhadra, Raurava, Makuṭa, Vimala, Candrahāsa (Candra-jñāna), Mukhayugbimba (Mukha-bimba), Udgīta (Prodgīta), Lalita, Siddha, Santāna, Nārasiṁha (Sarvokta or Sarvottara), Parameśvara, Kiraṇa, and Para (Vātula).*

Each of these Āgamas has its own Upāgamas.

Agamas in Literature

There is a diversity of opinion in regard to the question of the exact date of the earliest Āgamic writings. Various dates are proposed for these ancient writings, the extreme view being held by Mr. S. S. Pawate, who calls them as being as ancient as the Vedic, and surely far anterior to the date of the Smārta literature.[1] However, before entering into the details of the problem, it is proposed to give a brief survey of the occurrence of the Āgamas in Indian literature.

Appayya Dikṣit in his commentary on his own work *Śivatattva-viveka* (St. 47) refers to the Śivāgama. He flourished during the reign of Shah Jahan (1627–1658). Sāyaṇa refers to the Śivāgamas in his *Jaiminī Nyāyamālā*. Mādhavācārya refers to about six Śaivāgamas, while writing on the topic of 'Śaiva-darśana' in his famous work the *Sarvadarśana saṅgraha*. Bhāravi refers to the Āgamas in his work *Kirātārjunīya*[2]. Kullūka, in his commentary on *Manusmṛti*,[3] quotes the authority of *Hārīta*, saying that these scriptures may be Vedic or Tāntric. Hārīta was anterior to Yājñavalkya. In the *Mahābhārata*, Yudhiṣṭhira is described to have told Draupadī: 'I practise Dharma not for obtaining any fruit from Dharma. I do it immediately following in the footsteps of the good, and not having disobeyed (the teachings) of the Āgamas (*Āgamān-anatikramya*)'.[4] We have already noticed the various references regarding the Āgamas in the Purāṇas. Besides the *Uttara-Kāraṇa Āgama* refers to the defect of the Jains at the hands of Tiru-jñānasambandar. The other Āgamas direct that the hymns of the earlier Śaiva saints Appār and Sundarar should be recited during the temple services.[5]

There is also a traditional story related in the Āgamānta Śaiva works. It is as follows: 'The Śaivas flourished in a place called Mantrakāli, situated on the banks of the Godāvarī river. There were four Maṭhas, beginning with the Āmarddaka Maṭha, surrounding the temple of Mantra-kāleśvara. When Rājendra Coḷa went to the

1. Pawate, *Vīraśaiva Philosophy of the S'aivāgamas*, p. 14.
2. *Kirātārjunīya*, V. 22.
3. *Manusmṛti*, II. 1.
4. *Mahābhārata*, *Vanaparva*, Adh. 31.
5. *E. R. E.* under *S'aivism*.

Ganges while on his victorious march in the North, he met these Śaivas, whom he, on his way back to his capital, induced to come and settle down in his kingdom. From that time the Śaivas immigrated into the Toṇḍai-maṇḍala and the Coḷa-maṇḍala. Since then an impetus was given to the spread of Śaivism and a very large number of original works belonging to the Āgamānta school of Śaivism were written.'[1]

Their Date

Though one is not in a position to agree with the extreme view proposed by Mr. Pawate, that the Āgamas may be of an equal antiquity as that of the Vedic literature, still there are sufficient grounds to believe that the Āgamas could have come into vogue much earlier than the Christian era. Mainly depending on the facts, that the earliest manuscript copy of the *Kiraṇa* is dated 924 A.D., that Somānanda and Kṣemarāja mention the *Mātaṅga* and *Svāyambhuva*, and other references from the Āgamas, and that the *Śivasūtras* must have been evolved out of the Āgamas, Farquhar argued that, 'From these facts we may conjecture that the earliest Āgamas, like the Hindu and Buddhist Tantras, are to be assigned to the seventh and eighth centuries, yet, until more evidence becomes available, we must not say more.'[2]

But the Āgamas seem to have come into vogue much earlier than this period, namely, immediately within a century or two after the writing of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* and the *Gītā*. The *Śvetāśvatara* already shows a clear indication of the lines of the development of the early Vrātya philosophy. The expressions like Māyin (used in connection with Śiva-Rudra), Prasāda (Grace), Bhagavat, etc. used in it do show how the early beginnings of the Āgamic philosophy could be traced to this ancient document. The *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* also was written during this period. And it required only a step further for the writing of the Āgamas. And eventually they are referred to in the *Mahābhārata* through the mouth of Yudhiṣṭhira and that too in the plural (Āgamān). Thus the date of the Āgamic writings shall have to be placed somewhere at the end of the *Mahābhārata* period e. g. about the second century B. C., by which time the *Mahābhārata* had become a complete work. This is a correct conclusion even from the point of view that the Āgamas contain so many borrowings of expressions from the *Bhagavad-Gītā*.[3]

The Āgamic System or Śaiva-Darśana.

(VAIDIC)

Mādhava in his *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha* deals with the Āgamic system under the title of '*Śaiva-darśana*'. Hence we have decided to summarize this Chapter, which gives a correct perspective in regard to the Āgamic teachings[4].

The three Categories

There are three categories or Principles distinguished as the Lord (Pati), Soul (Paśu), and the world (Pāśa). It should be noted, however, that the text says that, 'the Guru (Śiva) of the world having condensed in one Sūtra the Great Tantra, possessed of three categories and four feet, has again declared the same at full length. The three

1. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. II, pt. I, pp. 4 f.
2. Farquhar, *ORLI*, pp. 193-94.
3. Cf. Pawate, *op. cit.*, pp. 10 ff.
4. Cf. Mādhavācārya, *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha*, Transl. by Cowell and Gough, pp. 112ff.

categories are the three mentioned above; its four feet are Learning (Vidyā), Ceremonial action (Kriyā), Meditation (Yoga), and Morality or Discipline (Caryā). The souls are not independent, and the fetters are unintelligent. The Lord is different from these.

Siva: the Lord

Śiva is the Lord of the universe. Although participation in the divine nature of Śiva belongs to liberated souls and to such beings as Vidyēśvara etc., yet these are not independent, since they depend on the Supreme Being; and the nature of an effect is recognised to belong to the worlds, etc. which resemble Him, from the very fact of the orderly arrangement of their parts. And from their thus being effects we infer that they must have been caused by an intelligent being. The universal acknowledgment of a Supreme Being is confirmed by the strength of this inference.

God is the universal agent, but not irrespective of the actions done by the living beings. Thus inference (as well as Śruti) establishes the existence of an agent who knows the various fruits (of action), their means, material causes, etc. according to the laws of the various individual merits. Omniscience: The *Mṛgēndra Āgama* says: 'He is omniscient from His being the maker of all things'. Further, the Supreme Being, as He has no possible connection with the fetters of matter, such as *mala*, action, etc. cannot have a material body, but only a body of pure energy (śākta), since we know that His body is composed of the five hymns which are forms of Śakti, according to the well-known text: 'the Supreme has the Īśāna as His head, the Tat-puruṣa as His mouth, the Aghora as His heart, the Vāmadēva as His secret parts, and the Sadyojāta as His feet'. And His body, created according to His will, is not like our bodies, but is the cause of the five operations of the Supreme, which are respectively grace, obscuration, destruction, preservation and production.

Saguna Isvara

There are passages in the Āgamas to the effect that, 'He is five-faced and fifteen-eyed', asserting prominently the fact that the Supreme Being is endowed with a body, organs, etc. It should be noted that there is no contradiction in His assuming such forms-which are, however, only by way of showing mercy to His devoted servants, since meditation, worship, etc. are impossible towards a Being entirely destitute of form. The *Pauṣkara* states that, 'this form of His is mentioned for the preservation of the devotee'.

The Five Operations

Bhojarāja states that, 'five-fold are his operations, creation, preservation, destruction, and obscuration, and to these must be added the active Grace of Him who is eternally exalted'. It must be understood that the word Śiva includes in its proper meaning 'the Lord', all those who have attained to the state of Śiva, as the Lords of the Mahēśvara, the emancipated souls who have become Śivas, and the inspired teachers (vācakas)'.

The Individual Soul

The individual soul, which is also known by such synonyms as the non-atomic (*Aṇaṇu*), the (*Kṣetrajña*), or knower of the body, etc. is the Paśu. For we must not say with Cārvākas that it is the same as the body, since on this view we could not account for memory, as there is a proverb

that one man cannot remember what another has seen. Nor may we say with the Naiyāyikas that it is cognisable by perception, as this would involve an *ad infinitum regressus*. Nor must we hold it non-pervading with the Jains, nor momentary with the Bauddhas, since it is not limited by space or time. As has been said, 'The object which is unlimited in its nature by space or time, they hold to be eternal and pervading, hence the soul's all-pervadingness and eternity.' Nor may we say with the Vedāntins, that it is only one, since the apportionment of different fruits proves that there are many individual souls; nor with the Sāṅkhyas that it is devoid of action, since, when all the various 'fetters' are removed, Śruti informs us of a state of identity with Śiva, which consists in intelligence in the form of an eternal and infinite vision and action.

According to the *Tattva-Prakāśa*, 'the liberated souls are themselves Śivas, but these are liberated by His favour; He is to be known as the one eternally liberated whose body is the five Mantras.' The souls are three-fold: (1) *Vijñānākala*, (2) *Praḷayākala*, and (3) *Sakala*. (1) *Vijñānākala*. The first are those who are under the influence of Mala only, since their actions are cancelled by receiving their proper fruits, or by abstraction, contemplation and knowledge, and since they have no 'fetters' in the form of enjoyments, such as Kalā, etc. (which fetters would, however, be the cause of cancelling actions by bringing about their proper fruit). (2) The second are those who are under the influence of Mala and Karman, since in their case, Kalā, etc. are destroyed by mundane destruction, hence their name Praḷayākala. (3) The third are those who are bound in the three fetters of Mala, Māyā, and Karman, hence their name Sakala. The first class are again subdivided into *Samāpta-Kaluṣaḥ* and *Asamāpta-Kaluṣaḥ*, according as their inherent corruption is perfectly exhausted or not. The former, having received the mature penalties of their corruptions, are now as foremost of men and worthy of priviledge, raised by Śiva's favour to the rank of the Lords of knowledge (the Vidyeśvaras), Ananta, and the rest. The *Bahudaivatya* describes the Vidyeśvaras as 'Ananta, Sūkṣma, Śivottama, Ekanētra, Ekarudra, Trimūrtika, Śrīkaṇṭha and Śikhaṇḍin. It is that the latter, Śiva in his mercy, raises to the rank of the seventy million Mantras.

(2) The *Praḷayākalas* are also twofold, as being *Pakva-paśudvaya* or not i. e. those in whom the two remaining fetters are matured, and those in whom they are not. The former attain liberation, but the latter, by the power of Karman, are endowed with the Paryaṣṭaka body, pass through various births. Thus the *Tattva-Prakāśa* says, 'Those among the Praḷayākalas whose Karman and Mala are immature go, united with the Puryaṣṭaka body, into many births by the power of Karman.' Again, The Puryaṣṭaka is composed of the internal organ, thought (Śrī), Karman, and the Instruments. Aghora-Śiva Ācarya says, 'the Puryaṣṭaka is a subtile body apportioned to each individual soul, which continues from creation until the close of the Kalpa, or until liberation. It is composed with 'kalā'. Or as the thirty *Tattvas* beginning with 'earth' and ending with 'kalā', are assigned to each soul, and wanders by the law of Karman through all the bodies produced by the world.' The following is the full meaning of the passage: The word 'internal organ', which properly includes 'mind', 'intelligence', 'egoism', and 'reason', includes also the seven Tattvas which enter into the production of enjoyment (or experience), those called Kalā, time, fact, knowledge, concupiscence, nature and quality; the words 'thought' (dhī) and

'Karman' signify the five cognisable gross elements, and their originators, the subtile rudments. By the word "instruments" are comprehended the ten organs of sense and action. The *Kālottara*, however, declares, 'The set of five, sound, touch, form, taste and smell, intelligence, mind and egoism, these constitute the Puryaṣṭakas." But according to the Śaiva philosopher, "there is no contradiction as such, as we maintain that the Puryaṣṭaka is composed of a set of eight in the following manner:

(1) The five elements; (2) the five rudiments; (3) the five organs of knowledge; (4) those of action; (5) the four-fold internal organ; (6) their instrument; (7) nature (*Prakṛti*); and (8) the class composed of the five, beginning with Kalā, which form a kind of case. Thus the thirty-one Tattvas are formed of twenty-four Ātmatattvas, five elements, five Tanmātras, ten organs of sense and action, four organs of the *Antaḥkaraṇa*, and seven Vidyātattvas as enumerated above. Now, in the case of those souls who are joined to the Puryaṣṭaka body, Mahēśvara Ananta, having compassioned them as possessed of peculiar merit, constitutes them as lords of the world."

(3) The word *Sakala* also is of two kinds: (1) *Pakvakaluṣa* and *Apakvakaluṣa*. The former transfers them to the position of the hundred and eighteen Lords of the Mantras, signified by the word Maṇḍali, etc. ('Eight of these are called Maṇḍalins, eight again are Krodha etc., Vīrēśa, Śrīkaṇṭha, and the hundred Rudras, these together are the hundred and eighteen'). In this case again, the Supreme, having assumed the form of a teacher, stops the continued accession of maturity and contracts his manifested power, and ultimately grants to them liberation by the process of initiation (cf. also *Mṛgēndra* and *Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*). *2nd Class.* But as to the second class, or those called Apakvakaluṣa, the Supreme Being, as impelled by the desert of their respective actions, appoints them, as bound and endowed with infinitisimal bodies, to enjoy the rewards of their previous actions.

The Pāśa is *four-fold*, consisting of Mala, Karman, Māyā and Rodhaśakti.

Matter or Pasa

But it may be objected, "Is it not said in the Śaiva Āgamas that the chief things are the Lord, Souls and Matter? Now the Lord has been shown to mean Śiva, 'souls', and matter (or 'bond') is said to be the Pentad (Bindu, Mala, Karman, Māyā, and Rodhaśakti), hence matter will be five-fold. Then how is it four-fold? To this, the philosopher argues, 'although the Bindu or nasal dot, which is the germinal atom of Māyā, and is called a Śivatattva, may be well regarded as material in comparison with the highest liberated as defined by the attainment of the state of Śiva, still it cannot be considered as matter when we remember that it is a secondary kind of liberation as causing the attainment of the state of such deities as Vidyēśvara, etc. Thus we see that there is no contradiction. The *Mṛgendra* also calls it four-fold.

(1) Mala, though itself one, by manifold influence interrupts the soul's vision and action; it is to be regarded as the husk in rice or rust on copper.

(2) The 'overpower' is the obscuring power. As it is said, 'of these I am the chief energy, and the gracious friend of all, I am metaphorically called Pāśa, because I follow the desert.'

(3) Action or rather its consequences, Karman, is included, as it is being performed by those who desire the fruit. It is in the form of merit or demerit, like the seed and shoots, and it is eternal in or never-beginning series.

(4) Māyā is the fourth *Mala*, because herein as an energy of the Divine Being all the world is potentially contained (māti) at a mundane destruction, and again at a creation it all comes (yāti) into manifestation, hence the derivation of the name. It is said in *Saurabhēda*,

"The effects, as a form of the Divine energy, are absorbed therein at a mundane destruction. And again at a renovation it is manifested anew in the form of effects as Kāla, etc."

In the *Jñāna-Ratnāvalī*, a different mode of treatment is followed: "The Lord, knowledge, ignorance, the soul, matter, and the cause of the cessation thereof-these are collectively the six categories."

Kriya, Yoga and Carya

The Āgamas deal with these three parts in detail. A brief summary may be given as follows[1]: *Kriyā* or ceremonial action consists of the accomplishment of the Mantra, the twilight adorations, worship, muttering of formulas (japa), throwing oblations into fire, occasional ceremonies for the attainment of bliss, annointing of the preceptor and of the person entering on a course of action for final emancipation (sādhaka), and one's own initiatory ceremonies necessary to fit one for a worldly, and for an eternal life.

The *Yoga* part is described to consist of the following: 'The thirty-six principles; the deities presiding over them; the Lords of the different worlds; the individual soul; the all-ruling soul; the Power (śakti); the direct perception of Māyā and Mahā-māyā, which are the causes of the world; the attainment of the miraculous powers, minuteness, lightness, etc. for those who concern themselves with the worldly element; the methods of the restraint of breath, abstraction, meditation, concentration, and absorption in thought (samādhi); and the positions of the circles in the body beginning with the root-circle (mūlādhāra) or naval.'

The *Caryā* part consists of the following: 'Penances, a purificatory ceremony (Pavitrāropana), the foundation, and the natures of Śiva-liṅga, of the visible Liṅga of Umā and Mahēśvara, and of the Lord of the Gaṇas, or groups, such as Skanda and Nandin, of the rosary used for the muttering of formulas, and the funeral Śrāddhas. The prescribed actions that are mentioned are the eating of the residue of what is offered to another deity; the vilification of Śiva, the devotees of Śiva, the system of Śiva, and of the practices enjoined in the Śaiva system; the enjoyment of things belonging to God; and, finally, the killing of animals.'

---

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V. S.* (Strassberg. 1913), p. 126.

III

The Tamil or Siddhanta Saivism

Introductory–Early school of Nāyanārs–Their contribution to Philosophy–Their Mysticism–Nature of their Philosophy–Some Tāmiḷ Siddhāntists and their works–The Siddhānta S'aivism–The Siddhānta Mysticism.

Introductory

We have already observed how Śaivism as a religion was in a flourishing condition in the Tāmiḷ land during the Śaṅgam period. But with the dawn of the sixth century A. D., we find that a new impetus was given to it. In fact a new theology based on the Āgamas and a new school of mysticism begin to make their appearance in the country. Regarding the two schools of the Nāyanārs and the Āḷvārs, Professor Dikshitar observes, 'In the literature of the later sixth and seventh centuries a student of Tāmiḷ literature lives entirely in a new world, a world quite different from that of the Śaṅgam. The toleration which is the keynote of the Śaṅgam monarchs and people has given way to sectarianism. Religious sects, religious debates and religious persecutions become the order of the day. The same transformation is distinctly discernible in the language and style of composition of this period. The period of five centuries commencing with 500 A. D. may be generally characterised as an age of revival'.[1]

The two main doctrines of Buddhism and Jainism were already ushered in this land since long. And after about a period of one thousand years of the writing of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* and the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, we find that the wave of Bhakti rises again in every nook and corner of India. Many systems of philosophy and theological treatises come into existence. The Kāśmīr Śaivism, the various systems of Buddhist philosophy, the *Pāñcarātra-Saṁhitās*, the Śākta Tantras, the Śaiva Āgamas, the *Nārada Bhakti* and the *Śāṇḍilya Sūtras*, and here in the Tāmiḷ land, the two schools of the Nāyanārs and the Āḷvārs come into existence during this period. With its two new schools of mysticism, the Tāmiḷ knowledge, with all its branches of culture, flourishes under the cool shelter of the Pallavas, the Coḷas, the Pāṇḍyas, and the Ceras respectively. With the rise of these two schools, Buddhism naturally begins to disappear, and almost no vestiges of the same remain after about the tenth century A. D.

Early School of Nayanars

The early Śaiva school in the Tāmiḷ land consisted of the sixty-three Nāyanārs, whose lives are described in the *Pēriya-Purāṇam*. The main achievement of these saints lay in the creation of a firm foundation for the systems of Tāmiḷ mysticism and philosophy. The Tāmiḷ Śaivas, like the later Liṅgāyats, call themselves Māhēśvaras. The Tāmiḷ mystics or Siddhāntins, as they are called, made no distinction of caste, creed or sex in the cause of devotion. Though they were more liberal in their views, still, like the later Liṅgāyats they did not try to break off from the shackles of Hinduism of which they formed part. A mere purview of the list of the Nāyanārs may show how people of different castes and communities came together to build the structure of wisdom. For instance, Appuḍi Aḍigaḷ was a Brāhmin; Śiruttoṇḍar, a Mahāmātra

1. Dikshitar, '*Early Tāmil Literature*,' *I. H. Q.*, xvii, p. 3.

Brāhmin; Tirunīlakaṇṭha Yālpāṇar, a member of the Pāṇar caste; Enadi Nāyanār, a toddy-drawer; Arivaṭṭaya Nāyanār, a Vellāḷa; Kalināyanār, an oil-monger, etc. Besides, even the ranks of high and low did not affect them, while on their way towards the attainment of Bliss. For, we see that among the Nāyanārs are also to be found the names of Pūgaḷ, Coḷa Nāyanār, a Coḷa king of Uraiyur. The Nāyanārs did not make any distinction of sex; and eventually we find the names of some female saints like Kulaccirai Nāyanār, wife of the minister Maṅgayarkkarasujar, and others. The lives of the Nāyanārs, with the exception of a few, mainly consist of miraculous deeds. Many of them are known for their simple acts of devotion and piety. To quote a few instances: Mūruga Nāyanār supplied flowers to the temple of Vardhamānēśvara; Tirunīlanakka Nāyanār fed the Brāhmins; Tirunīlakaṇṭha Yāḷpāṇar used to play on his musical instrument, the *yāḷ*, the songs of praise sung in bonour of Śiva; Anaya Nāyanār played on flute for the pleasure of God; Kaṇṇappa Nāyanār and his wife offered fowls and peacocks at the temple of Mūruga, the god of the jungle; others used to supply incense, light lamps, provide for the wants of Śiva-Yogis by giving them food, clothes, etc. To sum up the whole situation in the able writing of Narayana Ayyar, 'Whensoever these devotees lived, it is certain that that was a period when ordinary conceptions of caste did not weigh very much with those who were Śiva Bhaktas, who regarded that a life of devotion to Śiva was much more important than sticking to the duties prescribed to the various castes. We see that the Śiva Bhaktas of the higher castes had no objection to eat with the Bhaktas of other castes e. g. the Ādi-Śaiva Brāhmaṇa Sundaramūrti ate with Śermān Pērumāḷ Nāyanār. Sundarar also married a dancing girl Paravai Nacciyar. The hunter Kaṇṇappa and Nanda, the Pulaiya, were as much entitled to sanctity as the greatest of the Brāhman Nāyanārs'[1].

Contribution to Philosophy

Besides their early practice of the Bhakti cult, the main contribution of the Śaiva Siddhāntins lies in the field of Tāmiḷ philosophy which is more popularly known as 'Siddhānta'. The two works of Nambiāndār-Nambi, namely, the *Dēvāram* or *Tēvāram*, and *Tirumuṛāi* comprise the whole of the teachings of the group of the Nāyanārs. In fact the works of Sambandar, Appar, Sundarar, Tirumūlar and Māṇikkavāśagar are throbbing with devotion and deeper sense of philosophy. Besides these, a later series of Santāna Ācāryas have written on the theological side of the Tāmil school. The Nāyanārs have mainly based their doctrine on the teaching of the Āgamas. They have introduced in their works the system of the thirty-six Tattvas, the dual doctrine of the Śiva-śakti, the main *mārgas* or modes of life, *Caryā*, *Jñāna*, *Kriyā* and *Yoga* along with the system of *Kuṇḍalinī* (or Tāmiḷ *Kuḍilai*). They have also added the element of mythology.

Their Mysticism

Best of all, their main contribution consists of their teachings in the field of mysticism. They have not forgotten to describe in detail their own experiments with truth while on their way towards the attainment of the Goal. They have expressed their pitfalls, their disappointments, and joys and sorrows frankly. As Sir Charles Elliot has aptly expressed it, 'In no

1. Ayyar, *S'aivism in South India*, p. 122.

literature with which I am acquainted has the individual religious life—its struggles, dejections, its hopes and fears, its confidence and its triumph receives a delineation more frank and more profound.'[1]

Nature of Philosophy

It has been a matter of general debate whether the teaching of Siddhānta Śaivism is pantheistic or theistic in its outlook. Scholars like Jnana Prakasar maintain that the Siddhāntists are but 'pantheists in disguise.' While others like Mudaliar point to the absolute theism propounded in their works, Rev. Arokiasamy has summarised the position very beautifully. He says, 'The Advaitam upheld by the Siddhānta has nothing in common with that of Śaṅkara. The latter holds pure monism where one only is without a second; while for the former, the universe (the soul and Māyā) is real and distinct from God. But while trying to keep clear of Śankara's view it has run to the opposite extreme. For it has postulated not one or two but at least four eternal and independent entities, which are independent of God in their existence, though dependent on Him in their evolution. It has wrenched from the hands of God the very existence, and left Him the modality under which existence presents itself.'[2]

So far as the relation of God and the soul is concerned almost all the Siddhāntins point out that the souls are in complete union with God on the attainment of Bliss. But the other entities, like the world and Śakti, have got an independent existence of their own. Therefore, the Tāmiḷ Śaivism is neither pure Dvaita, nor pure Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita nor Bhēdābhēda. It is a doctrine by itself. As we have observed it elsewhere, the main difficulty in interpreting these Vrātya systems mainly arises on account of the fact that they are trying to bring together the elements of the pantheistic Brahman and the theistic personal God Śiva. This is why their philosophic goal lies on the border-land of Monism and pure Theism.

Some Tāmiḷ Siddhāntins and their Works.

We propose to deal here with the life-sketches of some of the most important saints who flourished in the Tāmiḷ land. Besides, we intend to give a brief survey of the literary works produced during the following centuries.

(1). SAMBANDAR

Sambandar, or Tirunāna Sambandar, was born to Brāhmin parents at Śiyaḷi. An interesting story is related how he became a keen devotee of Śiva. When only three years old, his father took him to the temple tank, placed him on the bank, and went for a bath. Perhaps feeling lonely the child cried 'Mama', 'Papa', when Lord Śiva and His consort appeared before him and consoled him, Pārvatī giving him milk of wisdom. When his parents saw him thus drinking milk out of a golden bowl and questioned the child as to who gave it to him, the boy pointed to the distant temple; and sang in praise of the Lord. Sambandar was later on designated as '*Draviḍa Śiśu*' by Śaṅkarācārya. The *Pēriya-Purāṇam* describes the first meeting of Appar

1. Elliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. I, p. 217.
2. Arokiasamy, *The Doctrine of Grace in the S'aiva Siddhānta*, p. 14.
3. Cf. Dikshitar, *Studies in Tamil Literature*, p. 89.

with Sambandar at Tiruppugalūr, and later relates about their joint travel to various places e. g. Tiruvambar, Tirukkadavur, etc.[1] He converted to Śaivism the Jain Pāṇḍya king Ninṛa Śir Neḍumara Nāyanār, who flourished in the middle of the 7th cen. A. D. He composed many hymns, which are included in the first three Holy Books-the *Tirumuṛāi*. There is a diversity of opinion regarding the date of Sambandar. P. Sundaram Pillai, while refuting the views of Caldwell[2] and Nelson[3], opines that 'Sambandar could not have lived in any period later than the early years of the seventh century A. D.'[4] From the evidence of the *Periya-Purāṇam*, Sambandar was evidently a contemporary of Appar and Śiruttoṇḍar, known also as Parañjotiyar, a commander of the Pallava king Narasiṁhavarman I (630–660 A. D.). In view of this Dikshitar observes that Sambandar must have flourished in about the middle of the seventh century A. D.[5]

(2). APPAR

Appar, who was originally known as Tirunāvakkarasu Nāyanār, was born in a village called Tiruvamur near Panruṭṭi Railway station. He was a Vellāḷa by caste. He had become a convert to Jainism. But on account of the full faith in his sister's devotion to Śiva, he thought that his recovery from a terrible illness was due to her mediation alone, and became again a keen devotee of Śiva. He was a contemporary of Sambandar, who gave him the name Appar. He attained salvation in his thirty-second year at a village called Pumpugalūr situated at a distance of four miles to the east of Nannilam Railway station. Dikshitar opines that Appar must have flourished in the first half of the seventh cen. A.D.[6], he being a contemporary of Guṇabhara, who was known to history as King Mahēndravarman I (c. 600–630 A.D.)[7]. K. S. Srinivasa Pillai expresses the view that Appar's conversion to the Śaiva faith must have taken place before 613–14 A.D.[8] Ramaswami Sastri holds that Appar must have belonged to the latter half of the sixth century A. D., and continued to the seventh[9]. We agree with the view of Dikshitar.

(3). SUNDARAR

Sundarar was born to Brāhman parents at Tirunnavalur, which is now known as Tirunamanallūr, situated about eleven miles west of Panruṭṭi Railway station. A miracle is said to have taken place on the eve of his wedding ceremony. God Śiva is described to have appeared in an old man's guise and laid a ban on the marriage as he claimed Sundarar to be his bond slave. After much discussion the members of the village adjudged Sundarar as a hereditary bondsman to the old man. Afterwards

1. *Tirunāvakkarasu P.*, Sts. 246, 248, etc.
2. Caldwell, *Comparative Grammar, Intro.*, pp. 137–43.
3. *District Manual*, Pt. III, pp. 54–70.
4. Pillai, 'The Age of Tirugñāna Sambandar', *Tamilian Ant, Society Series*, No. 3.
5. Dikshitar, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
6. *Ibid*, pp. 95–96.
7. Cf. *Pallavas of Kāñcī*, p. 88.
8. Pillai, *Tāmil Varalāru*, Vol. ii, p. 63.
9. Dikshitar, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

Sundarar is said to have gone along with the old man, who later entered the temple and suddenly disappeared, proving to all that he was no other than the Lord enshrined in the temple[1]. Sundarar composed many songs, which are included in the seventh book of the *Tirumurai*. He was a friend of the Cera king Śermān Pērumāḷ Nāyanār. C. V. N. Ayyar holds that Sundarar must be placed in about the last quarter of the eighth century A. D.[2] Mr. Srinivasa Pillai proposes that Sundaramūrti died in A. D. 825, which is also recorded to be the last year of the rule of Śermān Pērumāḷ[3]. Raghava Aiyangar surmises that Sundaramūrti must have flourished in the first quarter of the eighth century. V. S. Ramaswami Sastri places him in the beginning of the ninth century A. D. Mainly depending on the assertion of J. Dubreuil, that the Pāṇḍyan King Varaguṇa (who must have been a contemporary of Sundaramūrti) led an invasion against the Pallava king Dantivarman (beginning from 775 A. D.), Dikshitar rightly observes that Sundaramūrti must have lived in the latter half of the eighth century, and the first quarter of the ninth century A. D[4].

(4). SOME NAYANARS WHO FLOURISHED IN THE INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

Mainly depending on the account given in the *Pēriya-Purāṇam* Narayana Ayyar observes that the following Nāyanārs must have been the contemporaries of Appar and Sambandar: Neḍumara Nāyanār; (2) Appuḍi Aḍigaḷ, whose meeting with Tiruṇāvakkarasu is detailed in Stanzas 10 ff. of *Appuḍi Aḍigaḷ Purāṇam*; (3) Mūruga Nāyanār, in whose house Appar lived some time, and who attained *Mukti* along with Sambandar; (4) Tirunīlanakka Nāyanār; Śiruttonḍar (these two lived along with Appar and Sambandar in Mūruga Nāyanār's house); (6) Konguliakkalāya Nāyanār, who gave food to Appar; (7) Maṅgayarakkarasi, the wife of Neḍumara Nāyanār; (8) Kulaccirai, his minister; (9) Tirunīlakaṇṭappērumbanor, who came to Śiyaḷi to see Sambandar; (10) Gananāta Nāyanār, who worshipped Sambandamūrti Nāyanār everyday[5].

(5). CONTEMPORARIES OF SUNDARAMURTI

Sundaramūrti describes all the sixty-three Nāyanārs. According to Ayyar, Sundaramūrti's contemporaries were: (1) Śermān Pērumāḷ Nāyanār; (2) Narasiṅga Munaiyaraiyar; (3) Eyarkonkalikkama Nāyanār; (4) Pērumilalai Kurumba Nāyanār, who obtained all psychic powers by meditating upon Sundarar; (5) Somāśi Mara Nāyanār; (6) Sadaiya Nāyanār, the father of Sundaramūrti; (7)[6] Īsagñāniyar, the mother of Sundarar; and (8) Manakkañjara Nāyanār.

(6). TIRUMULAR

Tirumūlar was the famous author of the *Tirumandiram*. An interesting story is related how he immigrated in Southern India from the North. The story describes: "He was one of the Brāhman Yogīs who had obtained the grace of Nandī, who was the permanent door-keeper of Śiva and who had the reputation of

1. Cf. Dikshitar, *op. cit.*, pp. 96–97.
2. Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
3. *Tāmil Varalāṟu*, II, pp. 72–73.
4. Dikshitar, *op cit.*, p. 97.
5. Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
6. *Ibid*, p. 126.

showing the way for Indra, Viṣṇu, Brahmā and others. He had a longing to see sage Agastya on Podiyal hills and began his journey southwards. Passing through Kedāra, Nepāl, Avimuktam, the Vindhyas, Kālahasti, Kāñcī, Tiruvadigai and Perumbarrappuliyur, he came to the banks of the Kāverī and found near Avaduturai, some cattle bemoaning the death of the cowherd Mūla. Having compassion upon the cows, the Yōgī got into the body of the Mūla and drove the pleased cattle homeward. On reaching the cowherd's house, the late cowherd's wife approached him, but he would not permit her to approach him. She spent a sleepless night not knowing what had happened to her husband who was unwilling to touch her or even to talk to her. Then those who saw him said that he was one of the great *Yogīs* whose greatness could not be understood by any one. Then he meditated upon God and wrote out the doctrines of Śaiva philosophy in three thousand stanzas at the rate of one stanza in one year. After having thus lived three thousand years he went back to Śiva's world."[1] Dikshitar points out that the name of this great author stands perhaps unrivalled in the domain of Tāmiḷ writers in general, and of mystic ones in particular.[2] His work *Tirumandiram* deals with all the philosophical and mystical problems connected with the Śaiva Siddhānta. Regarding the date of this famous author Dr. V. V. Ramana Sastri of Vedāraṇyam says that, 'Tirumūlar's name is included among the names of the Toṇḍar in Sundarar's *Tiruttoṇḍattogai*. Thus Tirumūlar must have lived before the ninth cen. A. D. Since Tirumūlar correctly explains the rare truths and teachings of Āgamānta, since the Tāmiḷ tradition is consistent that Tirumūlar came from Kailāsa, and since there is a great similarity between Tirumūlar's teachings and *Pratyabhijñā-Darśana*, it may be concluded that the time when he came to the south was one when the *Pratyabhijñā* doctrines were flourishing in Kashmir. Therefore, from the foregoing internal evidence, one may infer that Tirumūlar came to the south roughly in the sixth century A. D.'[3] Though we generally agree with the above line of argumentation still we cannot do so in connection with the data proposed by him. We know definitely well that the Kashmir Śaivism flourished in about the ninth century A. D. Is it possible then that Tirumūlar also flourished immediately after this?

(7). MANIKKAVASAGAR

Māṇikkavāśagar, whose utterances are as 'rubies', was born at Tiruvāduvar. He was a Brāhman by caste. He acted as a minister of the King Arimartanam of Madurā. The following works are attributed to him: *Tiruvāśagam* (almost his biography), and *Tirrukkoṛai*. About his life and personality Farquhar gives a lucid account: 'He was a man of education and position connected with Madurā, but a sudden conversion, in which the personal influence of a Guru was dominant, led him to give up his position and become a wandering devotee. That he was a cultured man who entered fully into the heritage of the work of those who preceded him is clear from his poems. Contents, style, diction and mastery of metres all show the accomplished poet. He uses freely the stores of the Epics, the Purāṇas, and the

1. Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 204.
2. Cf. His introduction to Mr. M. V. Visvanatha Pillai's Edn. of the *Tirumandiram*, Ripon Press, Madras, 1912.

Āgamas, and also the very rich Tāmiḷ literature that already lay around him. He knew also how to find poetry in local customs and homely stories, especially the mass of legends that illustrate Śiva's sacred sports.' He expressed his dislike for the Māyāvāda of Śaṅkara.[1] Dikshitar proposes the ninth century A. D.[2] as the period during which Māṇikkavāśagar flourished. That is also the date proposed by Farquhar[3]. Frazer and others place him between 800 and 900 A. D.[4] Pillai opines that he lived after the period of the *Tevāram Trio.*[5] Nilakanta Sastri holds that the Varaguṇa mentioned by the saint is not the two Varaguṇas available to history but the Varaguna of legend about whom we are to know anything yet, and he concludes that Māṇikkavāśagar must have preceded the *Tevāram Trio.*[6]

(8). SOME LATER WRITERS

Besides the above famous Tāmiḷ saints, there were also other writers of great repute, who flourished in the next few centuries. Pattinathu Pillai lived probably in the 10th century A. D. He wrote many beautiful religious songs, which are included in the eleventh Book of the *Tirumuṛāi*, Nambi-Āndār-Nambi was a contemporary of Nāthamuni, the Vaiṣṇava leader, and of the Coḷa King Rāja-Rāja the Great (A.D. 985-1018). His works are: a collection of the songs of the famous Trio called *De(Te-)vāram.* Rājarāja is said to have 'set them to music and arranged to have them sung in the chief shrines.' He wrote another work called *Tirumuṛāi* containing eleven books originally. The twelfth book was added to it in the 12th century. Its contents are: (*a*) The *Tēvāram*, (*b*) The *Tiruvāśagar*, (*c*) *Tiru-Isaipa*, lyrics of nine authors, (*d*) The *Tirumandiram*, (*e*) Miscellaneous poems, including Nambi's own works, (*f*) The *Pēriya Purāṇam*, or 'Great Legend, *a Liber sanctorium*,' which formed the 12th book composed by Śekkirar. By about the same time Kāñcī—Appar of Conjeeveram prepared the *Kanda Purāṇam*, which is the translation of the famous *Skanda Purāṇa* in Sanskrit. After the twelfth century A. D. a series of works were written, mainly dealing with the theological elements which were still in an undeveloped form till then. The authors and the works may be mentioned as follows:

(9). THE FOURTEEN SIDDHANTA SASTRAS

Uyyavandan (A)	(1) *Tiruvunliyar*
Uyyavandan (B)	(2) *Tirukkaḷirruppadiyar*
Meykaṇḍa Dēva (first half of 13th cen. A. D.)	(3) *Śiva-Jñāna-bodha*
Aruḷnandi	(4) *Śiva-Jñāna-siddhi*
"	(5) *Irupavirupāthu*
Manēvācakam Kadandan	(6) *Uṇmai-vilakkam*

1. Farquhar, *ORLI*, p. 197.
2. Dikshitar, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
3. Farquhar, *ORLI*, p. 197.
4. *E. R. E.*, V, 23; cf. also Lassen (6th cen.) and Pope (7th or 8th cen. A. D.).
5. Pillai, *Tamil Varolāṛu*, Vol. II, pp. 77-125.
6. Cf. *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, pp. 66-7.

Umāpati Śivācārya	(7) *Śivappirakāśam*
" "	(8) *Tiru-varuḷ-payan*
" "	(9) *Viñā-vēṇba*
" "	(10) *Porripakrodai*
" "	(11) *Koḍikkavi*
" "	(12) *Neñju-vidu-tūtu*
" "	(13) *Uṇmai-nēri-vilakkam*
" "	(14) *Saṅkalpa-nirākaraṇam*

It should also be noted in this connection that the former, namely, Mēykaṇḍa Dēva, Aruḷnandī, Maṛai-Jñāna-Sambandar, and Umāpati 'together form a succession of teachers and disciples, and are known as the four Santāna Ācāryas'.

(10). SOME LATER WRITERS

There were also some writers of repute, who flourished in the following centuries e.g. (1) Kannaḍiya Vellāḷar (15th cen. A. D.), (2) Śiva-jñāna-Yogī (died in 1785 A.D), who wrote two famous Tāmiḷ commentaries, one lengthy, 'the *Draviḍa Bhāsya*,' the other, 'the *Laghu-Ṭikā*,' on the *Śaiva-Jñāna-bodha*, and he wrote the *Kāñcipurāṇam* in collaboration with his disciple; (3) Tayamānavar (18th cen.) wrote a volume of lyrics, 'which are equally famous for religious feeling, beauty of language, and sweetness of rhythm.'

THE SIDDHANTA SYSTEM

(*God : Pati*).

According to the Siddhānta God is omniscient, omnipotent, infinite, pure, one, absolute, perfect, just and gracious. He is the beginning and end of the universe. He is free from the limitation of time. He is the director of the universe. 'He is the source of all knowledge than that He is the possessor of the Knowledge.'[1] He is immanate in all beings, animate and inanimate.[2]

He is described as being Supreme Effulgence (*Paraṁjyoti*). He is in fact beyond the stage of Bliss (*Ānandātīta*). He is called *jyoti* (brilliance). Sambandar addresses him as 'the original *jyoti*, who could not be known by Brahmā and Viṣṇu.'[3] He further describes Him as "of the three (you are) the Mūrti who is the beginning and the middle."[4] Māṇikkavāśagar describes the gross (Sthūla) and the subtle (Sūkṣma) forms of Śiva. He says that, 'He is of the form of the Supreme Bliss (*Ānanda*).' God is the Highest soul (*Paramātmā*), and as Sambandar describes, "He is the *Ādi* or 'Source' of all *Jīvas*. The Jīvas are all forms; but their is much more subtler than the forms of the universe, because they stand beyond the five Bhūtas or elements which constitute the material out of which the universe is made. That is why even Śiva (lower), Viṣṇu and Brahmā are said to be *Rūpas* or forms of the universe (but according to the Śaiva, Śiva or Rudra); and that is why he is held

1. Sivapadasundaram, *The S'aiva School of Hinduism*, p. 57.
2. *Ibid*, p. 58.
3. *Sambandar*, 50. 9.
4. *Ibid*, 44. 8.

superior to Brahmā and Viṣṇu, and then the form of Śiva gets merged in the formless Śiva or Paramātman." [1]

Lower and Higher Forms

Thus according to the Siddhānta, Śiva possesses two forms, the Higher and Lower. 'The Higher is that of the ultimate Being from whom Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and everything else originate. The Lower form is that of the functioning Rudra or Śiva who helps *Jīvas* or embodied souls by liberating them from their bondage and taking them on towards final liberation or Mokṣa.'

The second Stanza of the *Padigam Tiruvilamilalai* composed by Sambandar describes that, "Vilamilalai is the seat of Him who is the end and the beginning: who is one, who becomes both male and female; who becomes the three Guṇas, who becomes the four Vedas, the five elements, the six tastes, the seven notes, the eight directions and who is (in becoming all these) different." Tirumūlar's conception of the *Aṇḍaliṅgam* is of the same nature. This is called in ordinary parlance as *Viśvarūpam* or the God's form of the universe. Like the Vedic bard Sambandar says of this Supreme Being that, "the One became many." [2]

Sambandar explains the higher form of Śiva as: "Well-established in the world are they who think of Śiva who seated himself (as Brahmā) in the lotus with the intention of giving existence to the Jīvas (e.g. Jīvātmās) manifesting themselves as Ākāśa, wind, fire, earth, Śāstra, commentary, Veda, three Guṇas, the paths, celestials, and others."[3] In the next stanza he relates, "Blessed by the Goddess of prosperity will be those who think of Śiva whose form is that of Hari who wakefully sleeps in the ocean of high waves, and who is mindful about sustaining men who live in the world of many mountains, and also the celestials and others who live in the other worlds" (Nos. 21.2). Further he observes, "Renowned will be those who worship Śiva, who assumed the first form with the intention of totally destroying (the bodies of) all Jīvas appearing as celestials and human beings, etc. in different worlds beginning with this world surrounded by the faultless ocean" (21.3). When Śiva manifests Himself in the universe, He becomes the Lower Śiva. Even in this stage, according to Sambandar, Śiva is higher than Viṣṇu and Brahmā. He describes the Lower form as '*Mudal-tiru* or *uru*' (first Form). The Higher Śiva is designated as '*Aurvam*' or 'Formless'.

His Energies

As a Personal God Śiva is said to possess several energies, which are 'animations or activities that transpire in his grand presence.' Again, 'these activities are attributed to the Grace of God, which assumes certain forms and shapes susceptible of perception by the intellects of souls and are known as different apparitions of the Personal God. The chief apparitions observed in the Cosmic Universe are nine: 'Śivam, Śakti, Bindu, Nāda, Sadāśiva, Maheśvara, Rudra, Viṣṇu and Brahmā, each being subtler and more comprehensive than the one next below it. Each one emanates from the one above it, whilst the last one is an

1. C. V. Narayana Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 345.
2. *Padigam* No. 13, St. 2.
3. Sambandar, *Padigam on Tiruccivapuram*, *No. 21.1.*

emanation from *Śuddha-Śivam* or the *Para-Brahma*. Rudra is the manifestation that controls the activities in the Tattva or Cosmic Principle to which we belong and the form of Rudra itself assumes various other shapes, such as Vināyaka, Subrahmaṇya, Vīrabhadra, Bhairava, etc. for the purpose of helping us to secure divine grace.[1]

As the director of the universe, God is said to bestow the following gifts: 'Embodiment or Creation (*sṛṣṭi*), Sustenance (*sthiti*), Disembodiment or death (*saṁhāra*), Suppression or Obscuration (*Tirobhāva of Āṇava*), and Enlightenment or bestowal of Grace (*anugraha*).' These may be described as follows:

Gifts of God

1. *Creation*: During this state the souls lie in an unconscious state wrapped by the evil of Pāśa. God gives them Tanu (body), Karaṇa (sense-organs), Bhuvana (world), Bhoga (enjoyment) out of the Māyā they are clad in. He also gives them due initiative to rise and "feel the Grace of God, to rise up gradually in their level, and to finally get released from the bondages of Mala'.[2]

2. All the ordinary notions of Indian philosophy are detailed here.

3. Disembodiment (*Mahāsaṁhāra*). The souls are given a complete rest at the end of every Kalpa, which act is called Mahāsaṁhāra or Destruction.

4. *Obscuration*. The souls are thrown into the web of Saṁsāra through the *Mala* that binds them. Both the *Mala* and souls have not independent action, and God has to give them the necessary stimulus. 'The function of stimulating in man, the influence of Pāśa is itself an act of Grace, its object being to exhaust the Pāśa of its venom in due course. God therefore stirs it up and weakens it gradually until its virus is finally extinguished.[3]

5. *Anugraha*, or the bestowal of Grace, is necessary for the attainment of the goal (freeing the soul from its bondage). It is of two kinds-general and special, as the soul is made to enjoy pleasure in communion with God or in the mundane world.

The universe is said to arise out of the combined aspect of Śiva-Śakti. The universe is eight-fold: Earth, water, air, fire, sky, sun and moon, the sentient man, these eight forms He pervades, the seven worlds, ten quarters, He the One and many, He stands, so, let us sing" (*Tiruvāśakam*).

Eight-fold Body

Śiva and Śakti.

It has been noticed how since the time of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* Śiva is called Māyin, thus indicating his two-fold aspect *e. g.* of Śiva and Śakti. Further, like the Āgamic school both the Tāmiḷ and the Śākta schools of thought have given due predominance to the element of the Śakti aspect, though according to the former, *Māyā* vanishes away immediately there is the dawn of Knowledge. The Tāmiḷ poets also have introduced this Śakti element, and have given it also an exclusively independent existence of its own. Śiva-jñāna-siddiar describes Māyā as

1. Jnana Prakasar, *Philosophical Saivism*, pp. 26–27.
2. *Ibid*, p. 26.
3. *Ibid*, p. 27.

'indestructible, formless, one, seed of the world, non-intelligent, all-pervasive, a Śakti of the Perfect One, cause of the soul's body, senses, the worlds, one of the three Malas, cause also of delusion.' [1] This Māyā of Śakti has no independent existence as apart from God. It is a distinct entity and is not illusory as the Vedāntists hold it. (For further details cf. Āgamic System).

Māyā and the World.

The Siddiar describes the relation between the world and Māyā. All this universe is said to have spread out and multiplied from the primal invisible and subtle Māyā, into invisible, and grosser and grosser forms (I. 20). The work further emphasises that, "As the words and ideas, as the different states of wakefulness, sleep, etc. arise out of our minds, as the different states of wakefulness, sleep, etc. arise and merge in our life, so are the worlds evolved and ingathered by the Supreme God who stands united and at the same time not united to the world" (I. 31). Again the whole universe is the manifestation of the Tattvas. (For further details cf. Āgamic and Kāshmir Śaivism).

Evolution of the Universe: We need not enter here into the details of the problem of the evolution of the universe, as the Siddhāntists mainly base their doctrine on that of the Āgamic Śaivism (Cf. under *Kāshmir Śaivism*)

The Soul.

The Siddhānta mainly follows the Āgamic account while describing the details in regard to the nature of the soul. Souls are infinite in number. They are spiritual in form, and co-eternal. On account of the effect of Āṇava-mala they are in an impure state with God. As in the Āgamas the souls are divided into three classes according to the number of bondages they are subject to e.g. of Āṇava, Māyā and Karma :

(1) *Vijñānākalar*, those with one *mala* ;
(2) *Pralayākalar*, those with two *malas* ;
and (3) *Sakalar* those with the three *malas*.

Sabaratnam Mudaliar beautifully puts it in the following manner : "Although they are merged in ignorance on account of this bondage, yet they are fully capable of enjoying heavenly beatitude if they are released from bondage and enabled to feel the presence of God. Their release from the bondage of *mala* and their realization of the grace of God depend largely on their own exertions which are altogether impossible in their normal condition of dormancy. The great God, therefore, gives them a body out of Māyā and furnishes them with the organs of sensation, with the result that their intelligence is stirred up and they begin to know and act"[2]. The Siddhāntists accept the doctrine of Karma and Rebirth. With the soul are associated the five *avasthās* or conditions e.g. *Jāgra, Svapna, Suṣupti, Turīya* and *Turīyātīta* (waking state, sleeping state, deep sleep, the Turīya and the one beyond it). There are the forms Sthūla and Sūkṣma (gross and subtle). The souls are dependent on God. They can act only on the promoting of God. It is already

1. *S'iva-Jñāna-Siddiar*, Bk. III, Sūtra II. 53.
2. Quoted by Jnana Prakasar, *op. cit.*, pp. 178–79.

stated above that God grants the souls: (1) Tanu or body, (2) Karaṇa (sense-organs), (3) Bhuvana (worlds), and (4) Bhoga (enjoyment). The souls have to undergo rebirth till the time of realization. The Siddhāntins believe in the number of species being eighty-four lacks. (Regarding the ultimate position of the soul cf. under Mokṣa or Salvation).

The Malas.

The *Malas* are of three kinds: *Āṇava*, *Kārmika* and *Māyā*. We have already discussed the problem of the working of Māyā (Śakti in its impure aspect—*aśuddha Māyā*). We need not go into the details here regarding the problem of *Kārmika-mala* (which is mainly due to one's own Karma). All these three are the causes of the bondage of soul.

Āṇava-mala.

The word Aṇava is derived from the word '*Aṇu*', meaning an 'atom'. The word Aṇu is used by the Jains as meaning the 'soul'. *The Śiva-jñāna-siddhi* defines Āṇava as a material thing (II. 85) with manifold powers, pervading through the numberless souls as virdigris in copper (II. 80), causing their loneliness and inactivity (IV. 38); eternal and indestructible in itself, quitting souls ready for liberation only to attach itself to others that are still fettered (XI. 5,6). 'The soul conceives itself on account of Āṇava as a separate agent. The soul, on the other hand, is represented as by nature all-pervading and equal to the Pati through the bonds of deeds (Karma) (*Siddhi VIII*; *Tirumandiram*, 2006).[1] Jnana Prakasar proposes that Āṇavamala is a material principle of differentiation by which the one soul (—*Pati*, *Śivam*, *Paramātmā*) is parcelled out, as it were, into the many (*Pati*, *Śivam*, *Paramāmtan*). In other words Āṇavamala stands for and is in every way equivalent to the Avidyā of the Vedāntins.[2] Again, if Āṇavam is eternal how can the soul attain liberation? However, Sage Aruḷnandi adds an explanation: 'Hence when united with the Śivam, the *Mala*, *Karma* and body disappear from the soul'.[3] But Jnana Prakasar opines that, 'Āṇava-mala is eternal; so too is eternal the nexus between the Āṇava-mala and the Soul.'[4]

It is only right action and realization that makes the Āṇava-mala inactive. As Śivapadasundaram aptly describes the final state: 'If now the man acts, he does not feel that he acts, because he sees not himself. The soul becomes as it were the body of God. Just as the body only does and never says that it does, so the soul acts but feels not that it acts. Āṇava is gone. All the troubles of the soul are not at an end. It knows no sorrows, and knows not even joy; for without sorrows, there can be no joy. What it experiences can only be described as a joyless joy.'[5]

Mokṣa and the Siddhānta Doctrine of Grace.

According to the Siddhātins the *summum bonum* of life consists of becoming one (not identical) with Śiva. As Sivapadasundaram aptly describes it, 'The ultimate goal is becoming one with God. The soul has no power of its own, but has the

1. Cf. Jnana Prakasar, *op. cit.*, p. 180.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Siddhānta-Siddiyar*, XI. 6.
4. Jnana Prakasar, *op. cit.*, p. 180.
5. Sivapadasundaram, *The S'aiva School of Hinduism*, p. 60.

ability to use any power it receives. Its activities depend upon the amount of power that it receives. This power gradually increases and illumines the soul. At the goal the soul is once for all free from the hold of Āṇava and is filled with and enveloped in the love of God. It is then indistinguishable from God, just as a crystal pillar in the rays of the noon-day Sun cannot be distinguished from the light. It has then none of the activities of knowing, desiring or doing. It enjoys the inexpressible which knows no change, and in which all thought of lover, love and the beloved is absent.'[1] The Siddhāntins accept all the four kinds of Mukti *e. g. Sālokya* (living in the same world), *Sāmīpya* (proximity of the Lord), *Sārūpya* (attaining equality with the Lord in form), and *Sāyujya* (union with God), respectively.

God's Grace.

For the attainment of liberation God's Grace (*aruḷ*-precious, rare) is necessary. It is designated as Śakti-nipāta or descent of Śakti. It is a gift of God. The two main divisions of Grace in the Siddhānta are: (1) Created, and (2) Uncreated. Created falls into two divisions *e. g.* external and internal, consisting of the *Pāśa-jñāna*, *Paśu-jñāna* and *Pati-jñāna*. The uncreated are three, namely, *Icchā*, *Jñāna* and *Kriyā Śaktis* respectively. Tirumūlar divides it into four kinds: (1) *Manda*, (2) *Mandatara*, () *Tīvra*, and (4) *Tīvratara*. According to him these are the different degrees of Grace obtained by the devotees during the various stages of their mental and moral preparation.

Tirumūlar, in the eighth Tantra, stresses the point in regard to the status of the individual soul on the attainment of Bliss (ānanda). He says that, 'Paśu, which is *tvam-pada* of the Vedānta is said to be the Pati when it casts off the Pāśa (bondage), which is beyond *Nādāntam*. The *tat-pada* which is the final *knowledge* of *Bōdhāntam* uniting with the Pati is *Śiva-sāyujya*' (St. 2392). Again, on another occasion, he observes, 'Becoming Śiva is Vedānta-siddhānta. The remaining four are vain. If Sadāśiva that becomes Śiva reaches oneness, the wonderful Vedāntic Knowledge becomes Siddhāntam' (St. 2392). The other four *Antas* or teachings are *Nādāntam*, *Bodhāntam*, *Yogāntam*, and *Kālāntam*, respectively (Sts. 2386, 2387). The attainment of the Jñēya is even obtaining Mokṣa in Jñēya. The idea of duality must disappear. Appar in the 5th *Tirumuḷuca* states that, "He stood as one in all these worlds. He cannot be known by those who stood as two". We cannot end this brief survey without quoting Tirumūlar again. He observes, 'The Jīva-Śakti is *atītam*; Paramukti is *upaśāntam*, where everything ceases; Śivamukti is *Ānanda*' (St. 2474)". Further, he says, "These three Muktis are in three Turīyas; Upaśānta comes by meditation on the Om (St. 2474)". Thus as C. V. Narayana Ayyar observes, 'This Śiva-mukti is beyond Paramukti, which is Nādāntam.'

The four kinds of Śaivas.

Before proceeding with the problem of the details regarding the four modes of living (Kriyā, Caryā, Jñāna and Yoga) we shall see how the Tāmiḷ Siddhāntins detail the divisions of the Śaivas. Tirumūlar details four forms of Śaivism, calling them as Śuddha-Śaivam, Aśuddha-Śaivam, Mārga-Śaivam, and Kaḍum Śuddha-

1. *Ibid*, p. 54.

Śaivam. Later writers do not mention these, though they speak of Puṛappuṛa Samayam, Puṛu Samayam, Aḥappura Samayam, and Aham (cf. Śiva-Jñāna-Siddiyar, *Pāyoram-Poḷippuṛai*).

The four Sādhanas.

All the Siddhānta Śaivas describe the four *Sādhanas* which lead the devotee towards the goal. Tirumūlar refers to the four Sādhanas e.g. *Caryā*, *Kriyā*, *Yoga* and *Jñāna*, and the three kinds of *Dīkṣās*, namely, *Samaya*, *Viśeṣa* and *Nirvāṇa*. The doctrine of Bhakti is not mentioned separately as the four mentioned above begin from, are expressions of, and terminate in Bhakti. *The four ways* (mārga)—In Stanza 1484, Tirumūlar describes the Mārgas under the four headings: Sanmārga, Sakhā-mārga, Satputra-mārga and Dāsa-mārga, respectively. He says that Sanmārga is the best of all.

External and Internal Creeds.

Tirumūlar refers to the *Puṛaccamayas* (external creeds) and the *Uṭcamayas* (internal creeds). The commentator defines the *Puṛaccamayas* as consisting of *Bhairavam*, *Jainism*, *Pāñcarātram*, *Bhaṭṭacaryam*, *Lokāyatam* and *Śūnyavādam*. But Narayana Ayyar seems to be right when he observes that, 'but the commentator seems to be wrong in so far as Tirumūlar speaks of the followers of the six paths as those who seek God (St. 1535). It seems that the six Siddhāntas, which arose from the Śaiva Āgamas, became Samayas, because, they required the Dīkṣā or the ceremony of initiation for people to accept them as religious paths.'[1]

Yoga.

The Śaiva Siddhāntins preach the Yoga system. It is not Patañjali's Yoga.[2] The Śaiva-siddhāntins also describe the importance of the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti. The *Tirumandiram* deals with the different aspects of the Yoga system. The third Tantra starts with an account of the eight-limbed Yoga (*aṣṭāṅga-yoga*), details at length the various topics of *Yama*, *Niyama*, *Āsana*, *Prāṇāyāma*, *Pratyāhāra*, *Dhāraṇā*, *Dhyāna* and *Samādhi*, and concludes that part by mentioning the fruits that shall be realized by going through each of the eight practices. Again in the first section of the seventh Tantra, Tirumūlar deals with the six *Ādhāras* or *Cakras*: the *Mūlādhāra*, *Svādhiṣṭhāna*, *Maṇipūraka*, *Anāhata*, *Viśuddhi*, *Ājñā*. According to him the purification of the *Ādhāras* enables the purification of the *Nāḍis* (St. 1707). The Siddhāntins also lay stress on the working of the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti.

Other Topics.

Like their predecessors and successors, the Tāmiḻ devotional saints lay stress on the different topics e.g. the importance of Name, the significance of a Guru, the importance of penance, worship, Śiva's feet, etc. However, we need not enter into the details here.

1. C. V. N. Ayyar, *op. cit.*, p. 263.
2. *Ibid.* pp. 231 ff.

IV

Kashmir Saivism or the Trika System

Introductory—Vasugupta—Pratyabhijñā-śāstra-History of Religious Literature—The Main Tenets—The Supreme Being—S'iva-S'akti—the Five Fundamental Aspects—The Tattvas-Process of Manifestation—Māyā—The Six Kañcukas and Puruṣa—Kashmir S'aivism and the Sāṅkhya—Some General Observations.

I. INTRODUCTORY

The Kashmir Śaivism, or as it is otherwise called the Trika-Śāsana, is a type of Idealistic Monism[1] (Advaita). We know for certain that the doctrine of Monism as preached by some of the Upaniṣads, or later on by Śaṅkarācārya, never formed part of the early philosophical teachings of the proto-Indians. But as Farquhar has pointed out, the teachings of Śaṅkara during his controversial tours must have influenced the Śaiva leaders in Kashmir very deeply and acted as a source of the stimulus which created the *Śiva-sūtras* and the movement which followed it.[2] It should also be noted in this connection that the later Dravidian schools of philosophy including Śāktism owe so much to this Trika system.

According to Chatterji the main literature of the Trika falls under three divisions, namely, (1) the Āgama-śāstra; (2) the Spanda-śāstra; and (3) the Pratyabhijñā-śāstra. Bühler and later R. G. Bhandarkar tried to differentiate the Spanda from the Pratyabhijñā-śāstra, and opined that the two Śāstras were different systems of philosophy. But we agree with Mr. Chatterji when he says that, "(such a notion) is based on error. The term Śāstra as employed in this connection does not mean a separate system but a treatise or treatises dealing with a particular aspect or aspects of the same system. As is well known these works do not represent so many different systems but only treatises on the various aspects of the same systems of thought, namely, the Trika."[4]

Of the three branches of the Trika, the authorship of the Āgama-śāstra is attributed to Śiva Himself, whereas, the Spanda and the Pratyabhijñā Śāstras are said to have been promulgated by Vasugupta and Siddha-Somānanda respectively. The writings of Vasugupta come to us merely in the form of 'revelations and articles of faith.' But it was Somānanda that gave a philosophical back-ground to the system.

The problem of the life and teachings of Vasugupta is still shrouded in mystery.

Vasugupta

The general tradition has it that, 'he lived in retirement, as a holy sage, in the charming valley of what is now called the Hārwan stream (the ancient Ṣaḍarhad-vana) behind the Śālimār garden near Śrīnagar.[5] Besides, there are a number of legendary accounts regarding the life and personality of this author.

---

1. Cf. in *S'iva-dṛṣṭi* of Somānanda it is said: अस्मद्रूपसमाविष्टः
   अस्मद्रूपसमाविष्टः स्वात्मनात्मनिवारणे ।
   शिवः करोतु निजया नमः शक्त्या ततात्मने ॥
2. Farquhar, *ORLI.*, p. 198.
3. R.G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism*, etc., p. 183 (Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, IV).
4. Chatterji, *Kashmir Saivism*, p. 7 (fn.).
5. *Ibid.*, p. 23; Cf. also *S'iva-sūtra-vimarśinī*.

The *Śiva-sūtra-vimarśinī* narrates that, 'Vasugupta, while residing in his hermitage below the Mahādeva peak, had one night a dream in which Śiva, who was moved to compassion to see the world immersed in spiritual darkness, appeared and disclosed to the sage the existence of certain Sūtras, embodying the essence of Śiva-śāsana, which were to be found inscribed on a rock. The rock had been, Vasugupta was informed in the dream, lying in a certain part of the valley, with the inscribed side downwards and hidden from the profane gaze. But if he went in the morning, he was also told in the dream, the rock would turn over by its own accord by his very touch and he should then learn the Sūtras of which the meaning would be revealed to him and he should teach them to worthy pupils. There is still a rock there called Śaṅkarpal, which is pointed out as the same referred to above'.[1]

Another tradition is current, namely, that 'the version of the Sūtras, although composed by Śiva Himself, were taught to Vasugupta by a Siddha.' And the incident of the rock is not mentioned here.[2]

Whatever might be the real truth behind these traditions, one fact is apparent that Vasugupta was the promulgator of the system. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* states that Kallaṭa flourished during the reign of King Avantivarman (855-883 A. D.).[3] Evidently his Guru Vasugupta must have flourished either in the early beginning of the ninth or the end of the 8th century A. D.

Tradition attributes the authorship of the *Spandāmṛta* to Vasugupta and asserts that Kallaṭa's *Spanda-sūtras* and *Kārikās* are an outcome of the same. The *Spanda-kārikās* along with the short *Vivṛtti* on the same are together called *Spanda-sarvasva*.

Pratyabhijna-sastra

Siddha-Somānanda, the promulgator of the Pratyabhijñā-śāstra, claims descent from the great sage Durvāsa himself and his mind-born son Tryambaka[1]. Chatterji is of opinion that Siddha-Somānanda was probably a pupil of Vasugupta and that he must have flourished about the same period of Kallaṭa. But as Sir R. G. Bhandarkar would rightly suggest it, Somānanda must have flourished in the first quarter of the tenth century A. D. He mainly bases his argument on the fact that Abhinavagupta, the pupil's pupil of Somānanda is described to have written glosses and detailed explanations on the Sūtras of his Guru Udayākara. However, it is far more certain that Somānanda was the founder of the Pratyabhijñā system.

History of Religious Literature.

Once the incentive was given the system took deep root in the minds of the people during the following centuries. A series of treatises were written. We, however, propose to deal with the subject very briefly (for the genealogical table showing also dates cf. *infra*). As related above, Vasugupta inspirationally received the *Śiva-sūtras*. The *Spandāmṛta* and the *Vāsavī-Ṭīkā*, a commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, are ascribed to his authorship. His pupil Kallaṭa is said to have

1. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
3. *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, V, 66.

written the *Spanda-kārikās*, the *Spanda-vṛtti* (or *Spanda-sarvasva*), *Tattvārtha Cintāmaṇi* (now lost), and *Madhuvāhinī* (lost), the last two being commentaries on the *Śiva-sūtras*. Later, Somānanda, who flourished in the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century A. D. (cf. *Supra*), wrote the famous work *Śiva-dṛṣṭi* and a Vṛtti or commentary on the same. Utpalācārya, the pupil of Somānanda flourished between 900-950 A. D. The following works are attributed to his authorship: (1) *Pratyabhijñā-kārikās* or *Sūtras*, (2) *Vṛtti* (only an incomplete manuscript available), (3) *Stotrāvalī*, (4) *Īśvara-siddhi*, and (5) *Ajaḍa-pramātṛ-siddhi*.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE KĀSHMIR ŚAIVA TEACHERS

(Cf. Chatterji, *Kashmir Śaivism*, p. 40)

Vasugupta | Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa

Avantivarman = Kallaṭa (pupil) = Somānanda = Muktākaṇa = Sivasvāmin = Ānandavardhana

King of Kashmir (855-883 A.D.) | Kallaṭa → Pradyumna-Bhaṭṭa (Mātulaya) | Somānanda (pupil of Vasugupta ?) | descendant of Nārāyaṇa-c. 815-900 A.D. during the reign of Avantivarman.

Pradyumna-Bhaṭṭa → Prajñārjuna (son) → Mahādeva-Bhaṭṭa (pupil) → S'rīkaṇṭha-Bhaṭṭa (son) → Bhāskara (pupil)

Somānanda → Utpalācārya c. 900-950 A.D. ... Rāmakaṇṭha (brother of Muktākaṇa and descendant of Nārāyaṇa-pupil of Utpalācārya c. 900-925.

Utpalācārya → Lakṣmaṇagupta (son and pupil) c. 950-1000 → Abhinavagupta (pupil) c. 993-1015. → Kṣemarāja (pupil) → Yogarāja (pupil)

Rāma (c. 900-925), a pupil of Utpalācārya wrote (1) the *Spanda-vivṛtti*, (2) a commentary on the *Mataṅga Tantra* (?), and finally, (3) a commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (?).

Utpala-Vaiṣṇava. To *Utpala-Vaiṣṇava* is ascribed the authorship of the *Spanda-pradīpikā* and other works mentioned therein.

Abhinavagupta was the pupil of Lakṣmaṇa. The authorship of numerous works are ascribed to him e.g. *Mālinīvijaya-vārttikā* (lost), (2) *Parā-triṁśatikā-vivaraṇa* (3) *Śivadṛṣṭyālocanā* (lost), (4) *Pratyabhijñā-Vimarśiṇī* (*Laghvī-vṛtti*), (5) *Ibid* (*Bṛhatī-vṛtti*), (6) *Tantrāloka*, (7) *Tantrasāra*, (8) *Paramārtha-sāra*, and others (which are not available to us now).

Bhāskara, pupil of Śrīkaṇṭha-Bhaṭṭa, wrote the *Śiva-sūtra*.

Kṣemarāja was the pupil of Abhinavagupta. The authorship of the following works is attributed to him e.g. the *Śiva-sūtra-vṛtti* (?), (2) *Śiva-sūtra-vimarśiṇī*, (3) *Pratyabhijñā-hṛdaya* (both sūtras and commentary), (4) *Spanda-nirṇaya* (in complete), and finally numerous commentaries on various Tantras.

1. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

Yogarāja, the pupil of Kṣemarāja, has written a commentary on the *Paramārthasāra* of Abhinavagupta.

Jayaratha wrote a commentary on the *Tantrāloka*.

Śivopādhyāya. The commentary on the *Vijñāna-Bhairava-Tantra* is ascribed to the authorship of this personage.

II. THE MAIN TENETS

The Spanda and the Pratyabhijñā.

We have already observed above, that scholars like Bühler and R. G. Bhandarkar maintain that the Kāshmir Śaivism had two different schools propounding slightly different systems of thought. Bhandarkar further pointed out that the main difference between the two schools lies in the fact, namely, that "the Spanda school mentions the dawning of the form or vision of Bhairava, or God, on the mind in the course of meditation and thereby the clearing away of the impurities as the way to the realization of the identity with God, while this (the Pratyabhijñā) maintains that recognition of oneself as God is the way."[1] In our opinion, this is only a difference in detail, and hence there is no necessity of treating these two Śāstras as systems belonging to different schools altogether. However, we shall now deal with the main tenets of this philosophical system.

The Supreme Being

The Supreme Soul[2] (Ātmā) is called Caitanya or *Cit*, Supreme Experience (Parā-Saṁvit), Supreme Lord (Paramēśvara), Śiva or Parama-Śiva (Supreme Śiva).

He is Real, Absolute, Eternal, Infinite, all-pervading, all-transcending and changeless. He resides everywhere, and eventually is the innermost self in everything. He is absolutely free from the Laws of Time, Space and Causation. In Him all the relations between the Experiencer and the Experienced, or subject and object, cease to exist.[3]

The Supreme Śiva is of two-fold aspect. He pervades the whole Universe in His empirical aspect, whereas, He is beyond all the Universal manifestations in His transcendental aspect. There is nothing in the Universe as apart from him.

Siva-Sakti

The empirical aspect of Śiva is called Śakti (Power or Creative Power). It is not in anyway different from, or independent of Parama-Śiva, but is one and the same with him.[4] It is his feminine aspect. Thus this system denies the God's having a prompting cause, or a material cause; or He Himself becoming the material cause, or even the existence of Māyā which is responsible for the appearances in this world. According to them, it is His free and absolute will e.g. Śakti, that plays the further game.

---

1. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism*, etc., p. 187 (Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, IV).
2. Cf. Chatterji, *Kashmir S'aivism*.
3. *S'iva-Dṛṣṭi*, i, 2.
4. Cf. न शिवः शक्तिरहितो न शक्तिर्व्यतिरेकिणी. *S'iva-Dṛṣṭi*, iii, 2, 3.

Fundamental aspects

Among the innumerable aspects of Śakti the following are the five fundamental and primary ones:

(1) *Cit-Śakti*: The power of self-revelation.

(2) *Ānanda-Śakti*: The power of realizing absolute Bliss and Joy.

(3) *Icchā-Śakti*: The power of feeling oneself as supremely able and of an absolutely irresistible will.

(4) *Jñāna-Śakti*: The power of knowledge or knowing, and

(5) *Kriyā-Śakti*: The power of creating.

It should be noted in this connection that though the Parama-Śiva in His aspect of Śakti creates this vast universe, still, He remains unaffected by this manifestation. When Śakti expands or opens herself out (*unmiṣati*), the Universe comes into existence, and when she gathers or closes herself up (nimisati),[1] the universe disappears as a manifestation i.e. as 'predicable', in terms of discursive thought and speech.[2]

The process of creation and destruction of the Universe is eternal without having an absolute beginning or ending. The phase of manifestation or actuality of the Śakti is called an *Udaya*, *Unmeṣa*, *Ābhāsana* or *Sṛṣṭi*, while a potential phase is termed a Pralaya (dissolution). A complete cycle consisting of a Sṛṣṭi and a Pralaya (a creation and a dissolution) is technically named a Kalpa.

The Tattvas

The Universe thus unfolded consists of the following Tattvas—(1) *Pañca-mahā-bhūtas*—The five elements constituting the materiality of the Universe *e. g.* Earth, Water, Fire, Air and Sky.

(2) The five *Karmendriyas* (organs of action) *e. g.* *Upastha* (Recreation organ), *Pāyu* (voiding or discarding organ), *Pāda* (feet), *Hasta* (hands), and *Vāc* (speech).

(3) The five *Jñānendriyas* (or *Buddhīndriyas*) are the five organs of knowledge *e. g.* *Ghrāṇa* (nose), *Rasanā* (tongue), *Darśana* (eye), *Sparśa* (skin), and *Śravaṇa* (ears).

(4) The five *Tanmātras*: consisting of *Śabda* (word), *Sparśa* (touch), *Rūpa* (form), *Rasa* (liquid), and *Gandha* (smell).

(5) The three capacities of mental operation, which are collectively called *Antaḥ-karaṇa*, (inner organs):

(i) *Manas* (mind), (ii) *Ahaṅkāra* (ego-personal), and (iii) *Buddhi* (knowledge).

(6) The two principles of the limited individual subject-object *e. g.* the Puruṣa and Prakṛti.

---

1. *Pra-Hṛd.*, p. 2; also *Spanda-Kā*. 1.
2. Cf. *Tantrāl-v,iv.*, Āhn, iii, and *Vijñā-Bhai-Ud.*

As seen above the Kashmir Śaivism accepts the main doctrine of the Sāṅkhya system of evolution, but unlike the latter, the former treats the Tattvas as mere derivatives and not as the final realities. Moreover, as will be seen below, the Trika science admits of innumerable Puruṣas and Prakṛtis, which vanish immediately after the stage of self-realization. This position is not accepted by the Sāṅkhya system.

As the Trika system treats the Tattvas as mere derivatives, it accepts also the following Tattvas:

(a) The five Kañcukas or cloaks of Puruṣa e.g. (i) *Kāla* (Time), (ii) *Niyati* (Restriction or Regulation), (iii) *Rāga* (attachment or interest), (iv) Vidyā (limited knowledge), and (v) Kalā (the power of limited creation).

(7) The five principles of the Universal subject-object.

(i) *Sad-vidyā* or *Śuddha-vidyā* (true or pure knowledge), (iii) *Aiśvara* or *Īśvara-tattva* (Lordliness or might), (iii) *Sadāśiva* (the principles of Being), (iv) *Śakti* (the power-principle or the principle of negation and potentialisation e.g. of Universal experience), and (v) *Śivatattva* (the Benign Principle).

Process of Manifestation

The doctrine of the process of manifestation is termed as *Ābhāsa-vāda*, *Ābhāsa-paramārtha-vāda* and also as *Svātantrya-vāda* (cf. *Spanda-sandoha*). The Ābhāsa or Ābhāsana is nothing but the 'shining out'.

Vivarta and Abhasa

The main difference between these two processes lies in the fact, that according to the former all the appearances are mere names and forms (*nāma-rūpa-mātra*) and can under no circumstances be regarded as real, whereas according to the Ābhāsa process 'the appearances also are real in so far as they also happen to be the aspects of the ultimate reality e.g. Parama-Śiva.' In fact as Chatterji rightly points it out, "with only this difference between them the two processes of Ābhāsa and Vivarta may be said to be practically the same. They are really one and the same process in so far as it is a process only—without reference to the ultimate nature of what that process brings about i.e. of the 'appearances' constituting the Universe."[1] *The first five Tattvas and Māyā*: It should be noted, however, that during the stage of the first five Tattvas, a particular kind of Ego (or Ahaṅkāra) is created e.g. "I am all this and all is mine as part and parcel of myself and all this proceeds from and is created by me. I am the author of all this, etc." But this Ahaṅkāra is not still bound by the ordinary laws of Time, Space and Causation as it still belongs to the sphere of the transcendental self. But when there is once a falling from the Śuddha-vidyā state, we find that the individual soul attains a limited ability to look towards the working of the Universe.

Maya

The Kāshmir Śaivites have partly incorporated some of the main elements of the doctrine of Māyā. Immediately after the stage of Śuddha-vidyā is over, the individual souls or 'limited' beings begin to perceive 'only the limited aspects of the Universe, and regard themselves as mutually

1. Chatterji, *op.cit.*, p. 55.

exclusive limited entities.' Thus, as Chatterji aptly remarks, "this latter manifestation may, therefore, be spoken as the limited process, as distinguished from the Universal process. This limited process is called Aśuddhādhvan or Māyādhvan, as the principle or factor which comes into manifestation as the first product of this order, and which afterwards dominates all the rest of it, is what is called Māyā."[1]

Further Māyā obscures and limits the experience in regard to the true nature of both what is experienced and the experiencer himself. During this state of the working of Māyā the All-experiencer, as it were, falls asleep, and the Universal 'All this', passes out of his view as a clear perception; that is to say, it is obscured, there arising in its place but an experience, rather a feeling, of a vague, indistinct and undefined something which is practically the same as the feeling of a 'Nothing'. And all the previous relations of the All-experiencer are changed.[2]

The main aspects of the Universal self before the attainment of the above state are: (i) *Nityatva* (co-evality), (ii) *Vyāpakatva* (all-reachingness), (iii) *Pūrṇatva* (all-interestedness), (iv) *Sarvajñatva* (omniscient), and (v) *Sarva-kartṛtva* (all-authorship). But when the above is superimposed by Avidyā or Nescience, a sudden change takes place in the above aspects, which afterwards become respectively the relation of *Kāla* (Time), *Niyati* (Restriction or Regulation), *Rāga* (limited attachment), *Vidyā* (limited consciousness), and *Kalā* (limited authorship). Evidently, these are imperfect and limited. It is henceforth that the relation of the Experienced arises. And the Experiencer for the first time loses the realization of himself.

Six Kancukas and Purusa

When the Universal self loses its original nature then he is designated as 'Puruṣa' in his lower state. "In order to bring the Puruṣa into existence, Māyā wraps him up both in herself and in the other five forms of limitation." These together with herself are called the Six Kañcukas (sheaths or cloaks) of the Spirit. It should also be noted that the Divine Experiencer Himself does not undergo any change. The Kashmir Śaivism assumes a plurality of souls as against the doctrine of the Sāṅkhyas. Each Puruṣa is called an Aṇu (lit. an atom).

Prakṛti: As the Experiencer is working under the influence of Māyā each Puruṣa must have a Prakṛti also. It comes into existence 'simultaneously' with the Puruṣa. She 'affects the Puruṣa and is acted upon by Puruṣa'. "Thus the Puruṣa and Prakṛti are nothing but the limited representation of the two factors in the two-sided experience of the Śuddha-vidyā state. As with the number of Puruṣas, the Prakṛtis also are infinite in number. This is all due to Māyā."[3] Prakṛti is called the *Bhogya-sāmānya* 'the generally experienced'.[4]

The Sankhya

After this, the doctrine follows the main system of the Sāṅkhyas which is already discussed before. As noted above, the main difference between the Sāṅkhya system and this is that the former assumes the existence of only one Puruṣa and Prakṛti from the combination of which the whole Universe is evolved, while the latter propounds that there are innumerable

1. *Ibid.*, p. 80. 2. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 83. 3. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
4. तदेव तु (प्रकृतितत्त्वं) भोग्यसामान्यं पक्षोभगतं गुणत्रयम्, तन्त्रसार, Āhn. 8.

Puruṣas and Prakṛtis who lose their independence immediately after the stage of full realization.

III. SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

As Chatterji has aptly remarked, "the Parama-Śiva pervades all the Tattvas and the whole of the Universe, and yet remains forever the same and unaffected by them, as it were standing beyond them all, transcending them all, so does each Tattva in regard to all the other Tattvas which succeed it. It pervades and permeates them all and yet remains ever the same, has still an existence of its own as it ever had, even after the Tattvas as its immediate and mediate products have come into manifestation......The process of the production of the Tattvas may, therefore, be spoken of as one of involution the Reality or Parama-Śiva being more involved, as, so to speak, it descends towards the stage at which it appears as the physical"[1].

Further, this countless number of individual, limited and mutually exclusive *Buddhis*, *Ahaṅkāras* and *Manases* of the decads of the *Indriyas* and of the quintads of the *Tanmātras* and *Bhūtas*, are each an Aṇu, as the limited Puruṣa itself is an Aṇu, a non-spatial point, almost like a mathematical point e.g. Puruṣa, an *Aṇu* of Pṛthivī, etc.[2]

The Tattvas, as they have a distributive aspect, even so have a collective aspect. In this aspect, each class of Tattvas forms a single unit and has an independent existence of its own. The collective entities are designated as *Tattveśas* (or Lords of the Tattvas) or *Adhiṣṭhātṛ-devatās* (presiding deities). The most important of these are: (i) Śrīkaṇṭha or Śrīkaṇṭhanātha in the Prakṛti Tattva, and (ii) Brahmā in the region of the physical Tattvas.

After the process of involution and differentiation is complete the Divine Śakti takes, as it were, an upward turn and begins to evolve and reunite what has been involved and differentiated.[3]

The Puruṣas also have different Universes. As the experiences have a collective existence, even so their 'Universes' also have similar existences, forming the experiences of the collective entities at the different stages. But while such distributively and collectively existing Universes must be very different in the region where limited beings have distributive experience, there can be hardly any such difference where the experience is not limited but universal, being constituted, and without any restriction as to duration and extension, etc. is timeless and speechless.[4]

It is worth noting here the opinion of Mādhava on this point, namely, that "these two systems do not enjoin restraint of the breath, concentration, and all that course of fantastic, external and internal conduct or discipline which the other schools prescribe as essential."[5]

---

1. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
3. *Ibid*, p. 165.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
5. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism*, *Śaivism*, etc. (Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. IV), p. 187; cf. also *Sarva-darśana-saṁgraha*, under *Pratyabhijñā System*.

V

Virasaivism

Introductory—Originator of the System-Basava, his Life and Personality-Religious Tenets of the Liṅgāyata-Vīraśaiva Philosophy—Vīraśaiva Mysticism.

I. INTRODUCTORY

Though the cult of the Liṅga as identified with Śiva is of pre-Vedic origin, still nobody had made it the basis of a philosophical system till the eleventh century A.D. In the proto-Indian period the Liṅga was identified with the Sun, and further with Śiva, the Supreme Being of the Universe. During the Purāṇic period the functions of Śiva came to be applied to the Liṅga itself. In fact, the various Purāṇic passages state that by worshipping or meditating upon the Liṅga one goes to the abode of Śiva and enjoys perfect Bliss. But it was in the beginning of the second millennium A.D. that a full-fledged doctrine was propounded, the religious basis of which mainly consisted of the worship of the Liṅga. This was evidently the system of Vīraśaivism. The Vīraśaivas, literally speaking the 'stalwart Śaivas', are mainly known by their more popular designation 'Liṅgāyats'.

Vīrasaivism and Mahesvaras

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, however, maintained that this was a 'new system by itself', and that expressions like Saṭsthala, *etc.* occurring in it are not to be found in any older system.[1] In our opinion, the system is in no way 'new' to Indian religion and philosophy. It seems to be a direct development of the doctrine preached by the Māheśvaras. Like the Tāmil Śaivas the Vīraśaivas also call themselves Māheśvaras. The expression 'Vīra' in 'Vīraśaiva', looks like an imitation of the original expression 'Vīramāheśvara'. Further some of the terminologies are borrowed from the cult of the Māheśvaras. Tirumūlar, while dealing with the system of the Māheśvaras in the seventh Tantra of his famous work the *Tirumandiram*, deals with the topic of *Saṭsthalas*, and refers to the six *Liṅgas* i.e. *Aṇḍa-Liṅga*, *Piṇḍa-Liṅga*, *Sadāśiva-Liṅga*, *Ātma-Liṅga*, *Jñāna-Liṅga*, and *Śiva-Liṅga* respectively. The above terminologies are partly to be found in the system of the Vīraśaivas also. The Vīraśaiva school is now affiliated to the 'moderate or sober' school of Śaivas known as the *Śaiva-darśana*, or *Siddhānta-darśana*, as it is called by its followers.

Originator of the System.

A great controversy has been mooted around the question regarding the founder of the system. Some are inclined to hold that Basava was the main founder of the sect, whereas others like Fleet believe that the real leader of the sect was Ekāntada Rāmayyā.[2] There is also a general tradition, namely, that the very ancient ascetics who founded the sect were Ekorāma, Paṇḍitārādhya, Revaṇa, Maruḷa, and Viśvāradhya, who are 'held to have sprung from the five heads of Śiva, incarnate age after age'. And according to this tradition Basava only revived the system. Brown proposed that these main founders were Ārādhyas. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar endorsed the viewpoint by adding: 'Taking all the circumstances into consideration what appears to be the truth is that the Vīraśaiva creed was reduced to a shape by the Ārādhyas, who must have been men of learning and holy living, and

1. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 190. 2. Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, pp. 559, 563.

the subsequent reformers such as Basava, gave it a decidedly uncompromising and anti-Brāhmaṇical character. And thus these two sects of the Vīraśaiva faith came into existence'.[1] Further, he postulates a period of about one hundred years between the origin and revival of this system. But according to Farquhar, the five founders of the sect probably seem to be the contemporaries of Basava, 'some older, some younger'.[2] However, the suggestion of Fleet that Ekāntada Rāmayyā happened to be the leader of the new sect appeals to us especially in the light of the story recorded in the inscription located in the Somanātha temple at Ablūr (Dharwar District).[3] The inscription belongs to the reign of Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Kāmadeva (1181–1203 A. D.) of the Kadamba family of Hāngal. The story itself may be detailed as follows :

"To a Śaiva Brāhmaṇa named Puruṣottama-Bhaṭṭa, who belonged to the Śrīvatsa Gotra and was an inhabitant of a town named Alandi in the Kuntala country, there was born a son named Rāma, who became an ardent devotee of Śiva, and by the exclusiveness of his worship of that God, acquired the name of Ekāntada Rāmayyā. While visiting many centres of pilgrimage, he came to Huligere (Lakṣmēśvar) where there was a temple of Śiva under the name of "the Somanātha of the (?)" and then to Ablur, which was a centre of Jainism and a stronghold of Śaivism having an important and influential Śaiva establishment at the temple of Brahmēśvara. At Ablur, he entered into a controversy with the Jains, who, led by one of the village headman named Saṅka Gāvuṇḍa, sought to interpret and put a stop to his devotions. A wager was made —the terms of it being recorded in writing on a palmyra-leaf, on the result of which the Jains staked their God and their faith. Ekāntada Rāmayyā won the wager. But the Jains refused to do what they had pledged themselves to do, namely to destroy their Jina and set up a Śiva in its place. Thereupon Ekāntada Rāmayyā himself, in spite of their guards, their horses and chieftains, and the troops that they sent against him, overturned the Jina and laid waste the shrine, and built for his own god under the name of Vīra-Somanātha, at Ablūr, a temple as large as a mountain. Later, the Jains went and complained about the whole affair before king Bijjaḷa, who becoming enraged sent for Ekāntada Rāmayyā and questioned him why he had committed so gross an outrage on the Jains. Ekāntada Rāmayyā explained the whole situation, and said that he was willing to repeat the same feat (of cutting off his head and placing it at the feet of the idol–only to be restored again) provided the Jains would wager their 800 Basadis. The Jains showing their unwillingness for such a proposal, Bijjaḷa laughed at them and dismissed them with the advice that thereafter they should live peaceably with their neighbours, and gave Ekāntada Rāmayyā, in public assembly, a *Certificate of Success* (Jayapatra). Also being pleased with the unsurpassed daring with which Ekāntada Rāmayyā had displayed his devotion to Śiva, he loved Rāmayyā's feet, and granted to the temple of Vīra-Somanātha a village named Gogave, to the south of Mulagunda in the Sattalige Seventy in the Banavāsī 12000. Subsequently, the record says that, when the Western Cālukya King Somēśvara IV, and his Commander-in-Chief Brahma were at Seleyahaḷḷiyakoppa, a public assembly was held in which

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *V.S.* (Collected Works, IV.), p. 191.
2. Farquhar, *ORLI.*, p. 260.
3. Fleet, 'Inscriptions at Ablūr', *E. I.*, V, pp. 343 ff.

recital was made of the merits of ancient and recent Śaiva saints. The story of Ekāntada Rāmayyā being told, Someśvara IV wrote a letter summoning him into his own presence at his place, and loved his feet, and granted to the same temple the village of Ablūr itself in the Nāgarakhaṇḍa Seventy in the Banavāsī 12000. And finally the Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Kāmadeva went and saw the temple, heard all the story, summoned Ekāntada Rāmayyā to Hāngal, and there loved his feet and granted to the temple a village named Malwaḷḷi, on the north of Jogeśvara near Muṇḍagoḍ in the Hasanāḍ Seventy in the Pānuṅgal Five Hundred."

Thus the above story gives us a clear perspective regarding how the basis of the Vīraśaiva faith was being laid. And eventually, it was only left for the great Basava to build a strong structure of philosophy on this foundation of Vīraśaiva mysticism. Thus if we can make a distinction between these two e.g. Philosophy and Mysticism—we may say that the first five Ācāryas, under the leadership of Ekāntada Rāmayyā or Ekorāma, were responsible for promulgating the school of mysticism, whereas Basava built a philosophical edifice over it. However, we shall now study the life and personality of this great Basava.

II. BASAVEŚVARA

Though the Vīraśaiva school of mysticism must have come into existence prior to the period of Basava, still the life and teaching of Basava really added a system of glamour to it, so much so, that he was later on considered even as an Avatāra of Vṛṣabha or Nandī. However, peculiarly like many other founders of philosophical schools in India, his life also is shrouded in mystery. Various versions are current, and they are recorded in different Kannaḍa works e.g. *Basava-Purāṇa*, *Cenna-basava-Purāṇa*, *Siṅgirāja-Purāṇa*, *Basavarājadeva-Ragaḷe*, *Vṛṣabhendra-vijaya* and *Bijjaḷarāya-Carita*. The *Basavarājadeva-Ragaḷe* of Harihara gives a slightly different version. Otherwise the other Purāṇas detail the traditional account as follows :[1]

'Basava was born at Bāgewāḍi to his Ārādhya Brāhman parents Mādirāja and mother Madalāmbikā. He was designated as Basava mainly because he was an incarnation of Vṛṣabha or Nandī. Later at the time of his thread ceremony, in his eighth year, Basava refused to be invested with the Yajñopavīta (sacred thread). Being pleased with this attitude, his maternal uncle Baladeva offered his daughter Gaṅgādevī to him. But, being persecuted by the Brāhmans for his propounding novel practices, Basava went to a village named Kappadi and engrossed his attention at the feet of Saṅgameśvara. In the meantime, Baladeva died, and the king appointed Basava in his place, and offered his younger sister Nīlalocanā in marriage to him. Basava began to propound and propagate the new faith with the aid of Cenna-basava, the son of his sister Nāgalāmbikā. For this purpose he was already staking large sums of money (especially towards supporting the Jaṅgamas). But his another rival minister Mañcaṇṇa informed Bijjaḷa about the whole affair. The Jain king Bijjaḷa being enraged at this showed signs of uneasiness and distress.

'In the meanwhile, Bijjaḷa caused the two devoted Liṅgāyats Halleya and Madhurayya to be persecuted. It is further related that Basava left Kalyāṇa, went to Kūḍalasaṅgama and caused the murder of the king through Jagaddeva. Eventually,

1. Wurth, '*The Basava Purāṇa* of the Liṅgāyats', *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, VIII., pp. 65 ff.

a civil war ensued in the city on account of this. 'Basava, hearing this, was absorbed in God Saṅgameśvara.'

The Jain Version: The Jain tradition narrates that the main cause of the murder of Bijjaḷa was that he had taken the beautiful sister of Basava as a concubine. The details of the murder are narrated as follows[1]: 'The king, while on his return from an expedition against the Śilāhāra Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, happened to eat a poisoned fruit sent by Basava through a Jaṅgama in the guise of a Jain. The necessary consequence took place. But, while on death-bed, he informed his son about the whole affair, and asked him to take revenge. His son eventually persecuted the Jaṅgamas. Basava, on the other hand, fled to Uḷavī and committed suicide by drowning himself in a well. His brother Cennabasava surrendered the whole property to the state, and later won the royal confidence again.'

Version narrated in Basavarājadeva-Ragaḷe: Harihara, the famous author of the *Basavarājadeva-Ragaḷe* details a slightly different version in his work[2]. Herein Basava is designated as a Pramatha named Vṛṣabha-mukha, and not as Nandi or Vṛṣabha as the other Purāṇas do. Further it is narrated that, 'Basava belonged to a Smārta Brāhman family, and that he had lost his parents in his childhood. After his sixteenth year, taking off his sacred thread, with full devotion towards Śiva, he left Bāgevāḍi. Later he received his *Dīkṣā* through Vṛṣabha and not through Saṅgameśvara as the other Purāṇas would have it. He is described to have done the *Liṅga-dharma* (wearing the *liṅga*) after he left *Kappaḍi-Saṅgama*. Later the story narrates how Basava happened to be in the service of Siddhanandādhīśa, the Bhaṇḍāri of king Bijjaḷa, how after the death of his master he acquired his property, and finally how he was appointed to the post of his master by the king.' We need not enter into the minor details of this narrative.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar maintained that, 'the principal incidents regarding the murder of king Bijjaḷa etc., however, may be relied as historical.'[3] But Dr. Fleet strongly remarks: 'hardly can any credit be given to these sectarian documents, which were moreover composed centuries after the incidents took place.' He eventually does not trust in the murder of Bijjaḷa, who according to him was not even a reigning king at the time of his death, but had abdicated his throne in favour of his son Rāja-Murāri.[4]

III. THE RELIGIOUS TENETS OF THE LINGAYATS

Over three millions of people have imbibed the spirit and cult of Liṅgāyatism, and they are mainly spread over the whole of the Bombay Karnāṭaka, the Mysore Territory and the Nizam's Dominions, and part of the Madras Presidency. The five original monasteries described to have been established are as follows:[5]

1. Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, p. 481.
2. Harihara, *Basavarājadevara Ragaḷe* (Kannaḍa work, Edited by T. S. Venkannayya, Mysore, 1930).
3. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
4. Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, pp. 476 ff.
5. Farquhar, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

Monasteries	*First Mahants*
(1) Kedārnāth, Himālayas	Ekorāma
(2) S'rîśaila, Near Nandyāl	Paṇḍitārādhya
(3) Bālehaḷḷi, West Mysore	Revaṇa
(4) Ujjini, Bellary, Boundary-Mysore	Marula
(5) Benāres	Viśvārādhya

Besides, there are monasteries in almost all the villages wherein the Liṅgāyats are in predominance. And they all belong to one of the main five monasteries detailed above. The Liṅgāyats are ordinarily divided into four classes e.g. (1) Jaṅgamas, (2) Śilavants, (3) Bañjigas, and (4) Pañcamasālis, respectively. The Jaṅgamas were not a 'profligate class' as some scholars would propose it. As we have seen elsewhere, the Śaiva ascetics had spread through every nook and corner in ancient India and evidently the Jangamas later on formed part and parcel of the same. The Jaṅgamas were of two types e.g. (1) Jaṅgama householders, and (2) Celibate Jaṅgamas. The latter class is held in high respect. The Celibate Jaṅgamas get actual training in a monastery and receive initiation (*dīkṣā*). They are again subdivided into two classes: (1) Gurusthalas, and (2) Viraktas. The former are to look after the domestic rites and are entitled to become Gurus. The latter are to instruct people in religious and philosophical matters. The monasteries (including the five main monasteries) in which the former reside are called Gurusthalas, whereas those in which the latter preach and practise are designated as Satsthalas.

Every Liṅgāyat has to worship his Guru and the small Liṅga, which he is ordained to wear 'in a reliquary hung round his neck."[1] After the birth of the male child the father's Guru performs the eight-fold (*aṣṭāvaraṇa*) ceremony, e.g. *Guru*, *Liṅga*, *Vibhūti*, *Rudrākṣa*, *Mantra*, *Jaṅgama*, *Tīrtha* and *Prasāda*. These are called the 'eight coverings' as they are deemed to grant protection from any sin. At the time of the Dīkṣā ceremony the *Mantra* consists of "*Om Namaḥ Śivāya*.' The Guru holds the *Liṅga* in his left hand, performs worship in the *sixteen* modes (Ṣoḍaśōpacāra), and hands over the same to his Śiṣya in his left hand enjoining him to look upon it as his own soul, and then ties it round the neck of the disciple with a silken cloth by repeating the *Mantra*.[2] But before taking the Dīkṣā the Śiṣya performs the ceremony of five pots which represent the five great monasteries. As Farquhar observes, the five pots are placed exactly as the symbols used by the Smārtas in their private worship are placed. The Liṅgāyats have to perform the worship of the Liṅga twice everyday. On the arrival of their Gurus, they have to perform the Pādōdaka ceremony in the usual sixteen-fold manner (*Ṣoḍaśopacāra*). The Liṅgāyats can be divided into two classes: (1) The Liṅgāyats proper, and the (2) Ārādhya Brāhmans. They arespread over in the Kannaḍa and Telugu Districts. The latter have more affinities with the Smārta Brāhmans, and wear a thread (Yajñopavīta) clug with the Liṅga. In our opinion, they seem to have been the first people who accepted Brāhmanism, and thus retained both the traditions—the original worship of the Liṅga and the later acceptance of the Brāhmanical cult of the Upanayana ceremony, etc. They need not be considered as 'outcast Liṅgayats' as some scholars propose to hold them. The Liṅgāyats observe the caste restrictions of marriage. They bury their dead. There is no objection to widow remarriage amongst them.

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 19. 2. Farquhar, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

IV. VIRASAIVA PHILOSOPHY[1]

The Supreme Being of the universe is the absolute, highest Brahman, which is characterised by existence (*Sat*), intelligence (*Cit*), and joy (Ānanda). It is the essence of Śiva (*Śivatattva*) and is designated as *Sthala*. The word *Sthala* is interpreted in two ways: (1) The various *tattvas* or principles exist in the Supreme Being originally, and even after the dissolution of the universe they resolve themselves into it. Hence by splitting the word *Sthala* as *Stha* (sthāna) + *la* (laya—resolving) we get the right interpretation of the word; (2) secondly, the "name is given to it also as it is the support of the whole material and spiritual world and holds all powers, all luminaries and all souls. It is the resting place of all beings, of all worlds, and of all possessions. (In fact), it is the highest place to be attained by those who seek the highest happiness, and, therefore, it is called the one only and non-dualist *Sthala* (position)." The *Sthala* becomes divided itself into two, namely, *Liṅga-sthala* and *Aṅga-sthala*. This is due to the agitation of its innate power (*śakti*). *Liṅga-sthala* is the Śiva or Rudra and *Aṅga-sthala* is the individual soul, the worshipper or adorer. Eventually there is a similar division in Śakti also *e.g.* into *Kalā* and *Bhakti* which restore themselves to Śiva and the individual souls respectively. The Śakti leads to action and entanglement with the world, whereas Bhakti acts in the opposite direction and leads towards final deliverance, and brings about the union of the soul and Śiva.

The Liṅga is of Śiva Himself. The Liṅga-sthala is divided into three components: (1) *Bhāvaliṅga*, (2) *Prāṇaliṅga*, and (3) *Iṣṭaliṅga*. The *Bhāvaliṅga* is without any parts (*kalā*) and is to be perceived by faith. It is simple *Sat* (existence), not conditioned by space or time, and is higher than the highest. The second is to be apprehended by the mind and has parts and is without parts. The third has parts and is apprehensible by the eye. This confers all (*iṣṭa*) desired objects and its name, because it is worshipped (*iṣṭa*) with care. The *Prāṇaliṅga* is the intelligence (*cit*) of the Supreme Soul, and *Iṣṭaliṅga* the joy. The first is the highest principle, the second is the subtle form, and the third the gross form corresponding to the soul, life, and the gross form. They are characterized by use (*prayōga*,) formulas (*mantras*) and action (*kriyā*). Each of these three is divided into two: the first into *Mahāliṅga* and *Prasādaliṅga*, the second into *Caraliṅga* and *Śivaliṅga*, and the third into *Guruliṅga* and *Ācāraliṅga*. These six are operated on by six kinds of Śaktis, and give rise to the following six forms: *Citśakti*, *Parāśakti*, *Ādiśakti*, *Icchāśakti*, *Jñānaśakti* and *Kriyāśakti*, respectively. These form also the ways of looking at God. The *summum bonum* of life consists of a union of the individual soul with Śiva (*Sāmarasya*). But as Sir R. G. Bhandarkar would suggest it, "the goal thus pointed out does not involve a perfect identity between the Supreme and the individual souls, or shaking off of individuality and becoming a simple soul unconscious of itself, which is the doctrine of the great non-dualistic school of Śaṅkara."[2] But according to him again there is a difference between the system of Rāmānuja and Vīraśaivism, in so far as, according to the latter, God possesses a power which leads to creation (and thus it is the power that characterized God) whereas the rudiment of the soul and of the external world is His characteristic according to the

1. We have mainly followed Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's analysis in this connection. Cf. *V. S.*, etc. (Ed. Collected Works, Vol. IV), pp. 191 ff.
2. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

former. Therefore, rightly does the learned scholar designate the system of the Liṅgāyats as a school of qualified spiritual monism. Bhakti forms the main characteristic of the soul. It is a tendency which leads towards the final realization and consists of three stages, and corresponding to these, the Aṅgasthala also is divided into three components. We are giving in a tabular form all the results of this system below.

I. THE LIṄGASTHALAS

(Cf. R. R. Diwakar, *Vacanaśāstrarahasya*, II, pp. 326–27)

- The Supreme Entity S'iva
  - Cit
    - S'iva-śaktyātmaka-Niḥkala-S'iva-tattva
      - Liṅgasthala (śakti-pravṛtti) Upāsya Śiva
        - Iṣṭaliṅga
          - Ācāraliṅga Kriyāśakti
          - Guruliṅga Jñānaliṅga
        - Prāṇaliṅga
          - S'ivaliṅga Icchāśakti
          - Caraliṅga Ādiśakti
        - Bhāvaliṅga
          - Prasādaliṅga Parāśakti
          - Mahāliṅga Citśakti
      - Aṅgasthala

II. THE AṄGASTHALAS

- Aṅgasthalas
  - (1) Yogāṅga (First and Highest—the devotee attains union with S'iva corresponding to the condition of deep sleep).
  - (2) Bhogāṅga (The devotee enjoys along with S'iva. Corresponds to the condition of dreamy sleep).
  - (3) Tyāgāṅga (Involves the abandonment of the world as transient and momentary. It corresponds with the wakeful condition).

Further there are two varieties of each :

- *Yogāṅga*
  - Aikya Sāmarasa-bhakti (Both united in Blissful experience).
  - S'araṇa Ānanda-bhakti (One sees liṅga or God everywhere).
- *Bhogāṅga*
  - *Prāṇaliṅga Anubhāva-bhakti* (Abounding all regard for life, renunciation of egoism and concentration of the whole mind upon the liṅga).
  - *Prasādin Avadhāna-bhakti* (Realization when one resigns all the objects of one's enjoyment to the Liṅga or God, and sanctity (*prasādin*) is acquired).
- *Tyāgāṅga*
  - Maheśvara Naiṣṭhika-bhakti (Having a firm belief in the unity of the Liṅga or God-takes a view and strictly observes a code of strict discipline)
  - Bhakta-Sad-bhakti (Leads a life of complete indifference, and practises devotion and rites).

THE TWENTY-FIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE SĀNKHYA SYSTEM

(From which all the later Vedānta systems draw inspiration in solving the problem of Metaphysics)

1 *Puruṣa*

|

2 Prakṛti (unmanifested)—manifested

3. Buddhi, or Intellect	10. Manas, Mind
4. Ahaṅkāra or Self-sense	11-15. Five senses (*Jñānendriyas*)
5-9. Five *Tanmātras* of sound, touch, smell, form and taste	16-20. Five organs of action (*Karmendriyas*)
	21-25. Five gross elements of ether, air, light, water and earth (*Pañcamahābhūtas*)

THE VĪRAŚAIVA SYSTEM

The Vīraśaivas add the following—just above the Prakṛti of the Sāṅkhyas.
(Cf. R. R. Diwakar, *op. cit., loc. cit.*)

Para-S'iva

|

1. S'iva	S'uddha or	2. S'akti.
	Cit-tattva	3. Sādākhya, 4. Īśvara, 5. Good or Pure Knowledge.
	S'uddhā-śuddha	6. Māyā, 7. Kāla, 8. Niyati, 9. Kalā,
		10. Knowledge, 11. Rāga, 12. *Puruṣa*.
	Aśuddha or Acit	13. Triguṇātmikā Prakṛti.

It is exactly after this that the remaining Principles are added.

V. VIRASAIVA MYSTICISM

Besides the other branches of culture, the greatest achievement of Karnāṭaka is really in the field of mysticism. It is worth noting that it was in this land of religion that the three great Ācāryas Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva flourished and preached their doctrines of the Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita and the Dvaita respectively. Added to this, Basava preached his doctrine of Vīraśaivism. Further in the beginning of the twelfth century, we find that a wave of devotion, which first originated in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, spread through the whole of India; and eventually many schools of mysticism sprang into existence i.e. the Vārakarīs of Mahārāṣṭra, the Rāmānandis, the Kabīrpanthis, the Caitanyas, the Vallabhapanthis, etc. Karnāṭaka also contributed its mite by rearing the two schools of devotion, namely, those of the Dāsakūṭa and the Vīraśaiva respectively. The Dāsakūṭa consisted of the followers of the doctrine of Madhva; whereas the Vīraśaiva school preached the main teachings of Basava.

All the teachings of the Śiva-śaraṇas, or the 'devotees of Śiva', are couched in small and pithy utterances called Vacanas. Every Śiva-śaraṇa had his own *nom-de-plume* or Title, consisting especially of the name of the God he worshipped. The Śiva-śaraṇas have also written many large philosophical treatises. However, it is proposed to deal here with the main aspects of their mystic teachings.

THE MAIN TENETS.[1]

'Do not think that I am a helpless woman and threaten. I fear nothing at your hands. I shall live on dried leaves, and lie in swords. Cennamallikārjuna, if you will, I shall give up both body and life to you, and become pure'.

Dark Night

Like all the mystics of the world, the Śiva-śaraṇas also passed through this stage. Like them they felt the pangs of *Saṁsāra*; they repented for their past actions; and now with full faith in God they placed themselves at the mercy of God. Here is a sublime psalm of Basava:

'Spread not the green of the pleasures of the senses before me. What does the brute know but to bend the grass? Take away my desires, feed me with devotion, give me a drink of good sense, O Kūdala-Saṅgama".

Other's Land and Money: Or again, the great Basava expresses that land and money belonging to others create unnecessary unhappiness in life. So he addresses:

'Brethren, bathing in the stream and washing yourselves, bathe and wash yourselves of the sin of living with strange women, of the lust for another's money. Wash yourselves of these. My Lord Kūḍala-Saṅgama, if they give up not these but bathe in the stream, the stream will have run in vain for them'.

Desire: Elsewhere, he observes that the body is not free from desires. Says he,

'The body has desires. They eat meat and drink liquor. The eye lusts and they fore-gather with strange women. What is the use of wearing your symbol, O God Kūḍala-Saṅgama?'

None is Yours: Again the Śiva-śaraṇas maintain that none belongs to us:

'What if they brother and cousin and great-grand-father and kinsmen? Those who are not yours, I shall not consider as mine. Devotion to kin is uttermost hell".

God's Mercy

Seeing abroad that there is all misery and disappointment, the devotee approaches God like a cow:

'Like the cow which has lost its way in the jungle, I am crying Ambā, Ambā. I shall be calling, God Kūdala-Saṅgama, until you tell me 'Leave them and be immortal.'

The devotee becomes disappointed when God still does not come to his succour. He says,

'Alas! My Master, you are without any pity. Alas! My God, you have no mercy. Why did you make me such a traveller on the earth? Why did you create me helpless of heaven? Why did you give me birth? O God Kūḍala-Saṅgama, listen and tell me. Could you not have made some plant or tree rather than me?'

He goes one step further and beseeches for His grace:

'If you are gracious, the dry stick will give forth shoots. If you are gracious, the dry cow will give milk. With your grace, poison would become ambrosia. With your grace, all good will be at hand, O God Kūḍala-Saṅgama!'

1. The translation of the original Kannaḍa songs adopted here is from Masti Venkatesa Iyengar's *Popular Culture in Karnāṭaka*.

The devotee, not becoming disappointed, still craves for His love and kindness.

God and Devotee Says Basava,

'My God, I wait like a woman who hath bathed and rubbed on turmeric and decorated herself, but hath not the love of her husband. I have rubbed on the sacred ash. I have put on the body (a rosary) of beads. But Lord, I have not your love. Men of our creed do not live as renegades. Love me and save me, God Kūḍala-Saṅgama.'

Thus, like the school of Caitanya, the love element as between husband and wife or even as between lover and beloved permeates the whole body of the mystic psalms of the Śiva-śaraṇas. Here is a fine instance of the type:

'I have bathed and rubbed on turmeric and have worn apparel of gold. Come my lover, come my jewel of good fortune. Your coming is to me the coming of my life. Come, O come.'

'I have been gazing up the path and thirsty with hope that Cennamallikārjuna would come. Now I take hold of cupid's feet; now I supplicate humbly to the moon. Cursed be separation. Whom shall I go and beg? As Cennamallikārjuna does not accept me, I have become a suppliant before everyone, my sister'.

Elsewhere the devotee enquires in moments of spiritual ecstacy:

'O! parrots singing so joyously, do you know, do you know? Swans playing in the margin of the lake, do you know, do you know? O cuckoos who lift up your voice and sing, do you know, do you know? O peacocks playing in hill and valley, O are you aware where my Cennamallikārjuna is? I pray you, tell me.'

Self-surrender *Complete self-surrender*: At last the devotee places his all-in-all before God:

'When I have said that this body is yours, I have no other body; when I have said that this mind is yours, I have no mind; when I have said that my wealth is yours, there is no other wealth for me. If I have known that all these three possessions of mine are yours, what further thought need I talk, O God Kūḍala-Saṅgama?'

Devotee afraid of none: Then the devotee is afraid of none. As has been observed in the beginning the poet expresses:

'Cennamallikārjuna, if you will I shall give up both body and mind to you, and become pure.'

Realization After these entreaties and self-surrender before God the mystic begins to enjoy the highest state of bliss (Anubhāva). Here is the perfect song of Mahādēvī-Akkā, who sees God everywhere: 'The one has become the five elements. Thus sun and the moon, O God, are they not your body? I stand up and see: you fill the world. Whom shall I injure, O Rāmanāth?'

God The Śiva-śaraṇas have given a beautiful description of the all-pervading characteristic of God. Herein one can see how mysticism actually falls on the dividing line of Dvaita and Advaita. Here are some psalms to the same effect:

'In hill, valley and cave, he said, and in flood and field, everywhere he saw God. Wherever he cast his eyes, there was God. Unseen of eye, invisible to mind, here, there, and everywhere was Guhēśvara overflooding space.'

Or again,

'He knows no diminution, nor growth. He does not move. He is the endless victory. Our Guhēśvara is the light within the light. Like the treasure hidden underground, like the lightning hidden within the cloud, like the light hidden behind the eye, O Guhēśvara, is your being.'

The Śiva-śaraṇas laid emphasis on the fact that everything is Śiva. 'How improper! Everything knows coming and going. Śiva does not. He who manipulates the machine is in everything; but can everything be He ?'

The Śiva-śaraṇas did not believe in the worship of many gods. Says Basava,

'To the Maraiya and Bīraiya, the sky-wanderer and the village-trotter, the Anṭara and Benṭara and Kanṭara, the Malaiya and Ketaiya, who dwell in the barren hillocks and on the wayside, in the wells and tanks and in the flowing shrubs and trees, in the midst of the village and in the squares of town and in the large banyan tree; and who want gifts of milch buffaloes and little calves; and who get hold of pregnant women and women in confinement, of the young woman and the daughter-in-law and who beg and fill their bellies; to these hundred pots of God-head, is not the one stick 'the Lord Kūḍala-Saṅgama is our refuge' a sufficient answer ?'

Ethics

The teachings of the Śiva-śaraṇis had a strong and firm ethical background. According to them a full and firm faith in God (Bhakti and Bhāva), and also Jñāna and Karma are the necessary requisites for the attainment of the highest goal. They believed in the doctrine of Rebirth and Karma. They laid emphasis on the importance of the name of Śiva and of his devotees. They were also, like Purandara and Kanaka, against the restriction of caste or sex in the cause of devotion. Says Basava, 'To God's servants there is no caste. Bad conduct is low caste. Good conduct is high caste. The real outcasts are not the people born in caste known as depressed but those whose lives are low and depressed'. The Śiva-śaraṇas also did not believe in the science of astrology. Further, the main contribution of the Śiva-śaraṇis is their idea of 'communal property'. In fact, they expressed that 'our earnings are also meant for the devotees of God'. Both Basava and Allama preached it. Besides, the Śiva-śaraṇas practised and preached their religion equally sincerely as the Haridāsas of Karnāṭaka did. They were tolerant towards other schools. They also preached that the worship of God should be performed with full faith. We shall, however, end this brief survey only with the truthful statement of the eminent Kannaḍa scholar Masti Venkatesa Iyengar, who says, "The Vīraśaiva movement made a great experiment. In revulsion from a dead formalism which seems to have been the prevailing feature of popular religion in those days, it emphasised the share of the mind and the heart as anything worth the name of religion and invited all people to realization."[1]

1. Iyengar, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

PART VI

THE VRĀTYA RELIGION

CHAPTER XIX

RESUME'

The foregoing pages really indicate how the early religion of Mohenjo Daro underwent a gradual development in the different parts of India. The early Mohenjo Darians had their own ideas regarding God and a fixed form of ritual. They were such that the Vedic Aryans had very little which can be called 'common' with the same. The Mohenjo Darians were image-worshippers or idolatrous, whereas the Aryans were nature-worshippers. The former used to bury their dead, whereas the latter used to cremate the dead. The former were monotheistic, whereas the latter were polytheistic and later on pantheistic. The former believed in devotion to God whereas the latter believed in fire-sacrifice. Thus, numerous instances could be drawn to show dissimilarities between the two religions. From all these differences and distinctions we have drawn between the Indus Valley finds and the contents of the *Rgveda*-which almost presupposes the former, one can very easily find that the Indus Valley people must be anterior to the Aryans. The former had already mixed themselves up with the Negroid race at the time when the Vedic Aryans came into contact with them. The Negroid element is absolutely foreign to India. And it seems to have come from Africa during an early period. How is it then, that the whole of the Mohenjo Daro religion had become absorbed in almost all the provinces of India at a time when the Aryans had not still penetrated far into the interior of India ?

Age and Antiquity

Different theories have been postulated both in regard to the home as well as the age of the Mohenjo Darians. Sir John Marshall, R. D. Banerji and their colleagues propose that, 'the pre-Aryans were responsible for the building up of the high civilization of Mohenjo-Daro, and that these were the same people who were known as Dravidians later on'. Waddell has tried to identify the Mohenjo Darians with the Sumerians[1]. Messrs Gadd and Smith have mentioned the immediate contact between Mohenjo Daro and Sumer[2]. Pran Nath attempts to identify the Aryans with the Sumerians[3]. Hunter emphatically asserts that the Indus Valley, prior to the arrival of the Aryans, was inhabited by Dravidians, and the Brāhmins of the neighbourhood are a remnant of this stock, but this is not certain, nor would it exclude the possibility of a riverine or maritime folk of a different

1. Waddell, *The Phoenician Origin of the Britons, Scots and Anglo-Saxons*, London, 1924.
2. Gadd and Smith, 'The New Links between India and Babylonian Civilization,' *Illustrated London News*, October 4, 1924, pp. 614-16.
3. Pran Nath, 'New Light on the Aryans before 1000 B.C.,' *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, July 7, 1935 ; cf. also *I. H. Q.*, VII-VIII, *Supplement*.

race being responsible for Mohenjo Daro and Harappa[1]. Sarup[2] and Dikshitar[3] have proposed a post-Vedic and an Aryan origin for the Mohenjo Daro civilization. Father Heras observes in the following manner: 'And in this regard history, by unearthing the hidden secrets of past ages, has revealed that in ancient times the Hamitic nations, which we now call Indo-Mediterranean, created the highest and most wonderful civilization in all the different branches of human knowledge'[4]. While some scholars propose an Elamite origin for the Dravidians and call them as being a branch of the great Caucasian stock, A. Regozin regards the connection between the Dravidians and the first Babylonian Empire—the Babylonians of Sumero-Akkad before the advent of the Semites. Elliot Smith and W. J. Perry[5] trace all civilized beginnings to an Egyptian and Mediterranean source. V. Kanakasabhai proposes a Mongolian origin for the Dravidians. Caldwell shows a keen contact between the Scythians and the Dravidians. Some scholars point out a keen affinity between the Dravidians with either the Australians or Africans. Risley[6] and Topinard try to identify the Dravidians with the black-skinned people of India.

Different dates also are proposed for the age of this early civilization. Father Heras, mainly depending himself on astronomical grounds, proposes 5600 B.C. Marshall and his collaborators call the Mohenjo Daro civilization pre-Vedic, and observe that it must have flourished in the third Millennium B. C. Scholars like Sarup and Dikshitar call the civilization *post-Ṛgvedic*, the age of which still oscillates between 3000 B. C. and 1000 B. C.

The theories of Risley and Topinard have become rather antiquated. Those of Sarup and Dikshitar look very orthodox in their nature. And unless the notion that the Aryans alone were a more civilized race than the Dravidians is wiped off, the followers of this theory shall not try to convince themselves regarding the truthfulness of the other side of the problem. There is great truth in the theory which shows a close identification between the Mohenjo Darians and the Proto-Dravidians.

If this be so, then the proto-Indians must have been a white, a fair race (as the description of the Vrātyas in the Mahābhārata shows), strongly built (as revealed by the Indus Valley finds), and not a misfeatured and black one as revealed in the *Ṛgveda*. We can also agree with the various scholars to the extent that they show similarities between the Egyptians, early Sumerians and Indians. The Dolicho-cephalic element is prevalent in all these regions. But what must have been the true origin of these early people of India, who were capable of spreading *their own culture* in every part of the world?

1. Hunter, *The Script of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro and its connection with other Scripts*, p. 12.
2. Sarup, 'Is the Indus Valley Civilization Aryan or Non-Aryan?', *Summaries of Papers*, The Eleventh All India Oriental Conference, Hyderabad, pp. 120-23.
3. Dikshitar, 'The Culture of the Indus Valley,' *Journal of the Madras University*.
4. Heras, 'The Hamitic Indo-Mediterranean Race,' *The New Review*, XIV, p. 185.
5. Perry, *Growth of Civilization*, I, p. 53.
6. Risley, *The People of India*, p. 45.

In our opinion, the evidence obtaining on the Indian soil alone is sufficient for our purpose. We have already shown in the various Chapters of our work, how there is a close similarity between the Indus Valley finds and the traditions depicted in early Indian literature and art in the different parts of India.[1] We have also tried to prove in Part I that the proto-Indian language and culture seem to be indigenous. All this may help us in postulating an Indian origin for the Vrātyas. Geologists have arrived at the conclusion that the Dharwar system of rocks is of hoary antiquity belonging to the most primitive era of Geology *i.e.* the Archæan; and that it is capable of originating the Early Man in the Post-Tertiary period. In our opinion, it must be this Early Man who spread his own race and culture in the different parts of India, in African Egypt, in Sumer and the other parts of the world. As he came into contact with the other races–the Negroid, the Mongolian, the Caucasian and others, different new racial types seem to have come into vogue. Thus if the Dolicho-cephalic element is the main feature of this early proto-Dravidian race, then the discoveries made by Dr. Sankalia at Langhnaj on the banks of the River Sābarmatī should easily come to our rescue. Mrs. Dr. Iravati Karve's remarks are significant in this connection: 'The height, the slenderness of the bones, the smallness of the joints, the relatively very long lower arms, the dolicho-cephaly, the well-developed occipital region, the very slightly negroid appearance of one of the skulls, as also the smallness of the pelvic bones would suggest, at the present stage of inquiry, that the skeletons show Hamitic-negroid characteristics and are of people akin to those of the north-east of Africa and perhaps to proto-Egyptian'[2]. All this proves our main hypothesis.

Spread of Religion

Naturally, it was the religion of this Early Man that spread itself in the various parts of India. The account of Berosus is interesting to the extent that the art of building and writing in early Sumer was introduced by people half-men and half-fishes. Father Heras is correct when he observes that these were the Mīnas (Sanskrit–Matsya) of Mohenjo Daro. Such a tradition also exists in Mexico. Thus these people, like the great Buddhist Bhikkhus in later times, travelled far into the other parts of the world and spread the Indian traditions there. The observation made by Father Heras in this connection is interesting. "The development," says he, "of the script of the two countries and that of Egypt, the titles of kings, the number of zodiacal constellations, the changing of the proto-Indian constellation of the Harp (yāḷ) for Taurus (the bull) which must have taken place in Sumer, the tradition of the ancient people of Mesopotamia recorded by Berosus, the parallel Biblical account in Genesis II, I. 5, all point to the same conclusion that the migration of the Mediterranean race commenced from India and extended through Southern Mesopotamia and Northern Africa; spread through Crete, Cyprus, Greece, Italy and Spain; and crossing the Pyrenees reached Central Europe and the British Isles"[3].

1. We have proved this is detail in our '*Cultural History of Karnāṭaka*', pp. 2 ff.
2. Sankalia, *Investigation into Pre-historic Archæology of Gujarat*, Baroda, 1944, p.14.
3. Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the most important Archæological Site in India', *Journal of Indian History*, XVI, p. 11.

The Christian Outlook

There has been a tendency among some of the European scholars to attribute all that is best in Indian religion to Christianity. It is pointed out that the story of Kṛṣṇa, the Gītā, Siddhānta Śaivism and Mādhvism have been greatly influenced by Christian notions and ideals. The greatest effort sems to have been recently made by Father Heras in connection with the mighty Indus Valley civilization. In one of his Papers he observes, "Having settled this point we could easily deduce that, since the Sumerians are Hamitic, the Proto-Indians, who are the trunk out of which the Sumerians are only a branch, must also necessarily be of Hamitic origin, just as all the other Mediterranean nations which are later issues of the same stock. As a matter of fact, the Hamitic origin of several nations belonging to this group is confirmed by new light coming from both sacred and profane history'[1]. Behind the whole of this phenomenon, one almost feels certain that the learned Savant wants to show that the Biblical teachings are in many ways similar to those depicted in or through the Indus Valley finds, and that these owe their origin to the same people, amongst whom was born Christ, the Son of God. But, suffice it to say, that with the aid of the rich materials at our disposal at present, we are not at all convinced by the line of argumentation followed by these scholars. If we can agree with Father Heras that the Mother culture of the Indus Valley period is indigenous to India, then it naturally follows that the later development of the various streams of the religious thought is also indigenous to India. And all the development that took place in the other parts of the world may also owe its origin to the soil of India itself.

Indo-European Home a Fallacy

While depicting the healthy traditions of the Mohenjo Darians regarding their notions of the Divine Triad consisting of Śiva, Ammā and Kārttikeya, the Liṅga and other gods, and everything relating to them by way of worship and ritual, or the building up of a higher philosophy, we cannot forget the slow emergence and amalgamation of the Aryan notions in the field of religion and philosophy. The Aryans were an equally great people spreading their culture from the border-land of India (including Kashmir and Kabul) to the region of Babylon and even Egypt. Their cultural activities are linked up in the various parts of this vast zone. The study of Comparative Philology has given us a further link regarding the fact that their culture had penetrated into the various provinces of the Western countries. In the Indus Valley period they seem to have been present. And as we have postulated, the Indus Valley civilization seems to have been a running civilization, extending itself up to the end of the period of the *Atharvaveda*.

The unique records of the rulers of Mitanni discovered at Tell-el-Amarna in Egypt, and the cuniform inscriptions of the Hittites found at Boghaz-Kōi in Asia Minor have really created a puzzle in the field of research. The names of the Gods of the *Ṛgveda i.e.* Mitra, Indra, Varuṇa, and the Nāsatyās, as revealed in the Hittite inscriptions, have raised another problem regarding where the Aryans were located-whether they had reached the Indian soil and returned to the Hittite region at this time, or one of their branches had migrated to this part separately. In our opinion, the whole notion of scholarship has to be changed in this connection. If we can believe

1. Heras, 'The Hamitic Indo-Mediterranean Race,' *New Review*, XIV, pp. 185 ff.

that there was a spoken Sanskrit language in the Hittite region, if we can trust that the people of the Avestic region (Iran) were speaking a living Sanskrit language, and also that in no other part of the world Sanskrit can be proved to have been a living language, then we are really in a position to postulate that the Aryans must have occupied the tract inclusive of partly Egypt, Babylon, the Hittite region, Iran and the borderland of India. This was the original Aryan home and none else. This may even give us courage to assert that the notion of an Indo-European or Indo-Aryan home is a fallacy, provided there is an inclination to locate it somewhere beyond the region we have chalked out. We shall, however, deal with this problem in detail in the second Volume.

Conclusion

We have also observed that the reformist Aryans like the Bhrgus seem to have played their role in the Indus Valley region. This is to be seen from the Akkadian contacts with the Indus Valley people in matters of the cylinder seals, pot-sherds, etched beads and kidney-shaped inlays of bone and other objects.[1] This need not disprove the original non-Aryan nature of the Indus Valley civilization.

We have not dealt with the problem of the early notions of our ancestors regarding animism, fetishism and other beliefs in greater details. India has passed through the Palæolithic, Neolithic and the Chalcolithic periods indeed! But human knowledge begins to dawn itself in a clearer perspective only from the Indus Valley period. The two cultures which have permeated the general life of the Indian are those of the Aryan and the Vrātya. If we try to sift out the real from the complex of the real and the unreal, we find that it is these two cultures alone that have acted as torch-bearers of humanity in the other parts of the world also. We have dealt here with the problem of the development of one of these, namely, the Vrātya.

We have devoted a separate Volume for the treatment of the remaining problems regarding the development of the Aryan, Buddhist, Jain, and other religions on the soil of India. We shall then be able to do justice to many of the problems which still require a fuller treatment.

---

1. 'It should also be noted that about seven or eight seals of Indian origin are found at *Ur*, Kist, Tell Asmar, Tepe Gawra and Susa in associations certainly or probably of Sargonid date.'

APPENDIX

We are giving below some important Purāṇic references regarding the topics detailed in the text.

Aṣṭa-siddhis, Brahmāṇḍa, Uttara-Bhāga, 18,11 ff.

Bhairavas, Rudra-yāmala ; Śiva, Śatarudra-Saṁ., Adh. 3.

The eight forms of Bhairava are: Asitāṅga, Ruru, Caṇḍa, Krodha, Unmatta-Bhairava, Kāpāla, Bhīṣaṇa and Saṁhāra. There are eight subordinate forms of each: (1) *Asitāṅga*—Viśālākṣa, Mārtaṇḍa, Modakapriya, Svacchanda, Vighna-santuṣṭa, Khecara and Sacarācara. (2) *Ruru*-Kroḍa-damiṣṭra, Jaṭādhara, Viśvarūpa, Virūpākṣa, Nānārūpadhara, Vajrahasta and Mahākāya. (3) *Caṇḍa*-Pralayāntaka, Bhūmikampa, Nīlakaṇṭha, Viṣṇu, Kulapālaka, Muṇḍapāla and Kāmapāla. (4) *Krodha*-Piṅgalīkṣaṇa, Abhrarūpa, Dharāpāla, Kuṭila, Mantra-nāyaka, Rudra and Pitāmaha. (5) *Unmatta-Bhairava*-Vaṭu-nāyaka, Śaṅkara, Bhūta-Vetāla, Trinetra, Tripurāntaka, Varada and Parvatāvāsa. (6) *Kāpāla*-Śaśi-bhūṣaṇa, Hasticarmāmbara-dhara, Yogīśa, Brahma-rākṣasa, Sarvajña, Sarva-devīśa and Sarvabhūta-hṛdisthita. (7) *Bhīṣaṇa*-Bhayahara, Sarvajña, Kālāgni-Mahārudra, Dakṣiṇa, Mukhara and Asthira. (8) *Saṁhāra-Bhairava*, Atiriktāṅga, Kālāgni, Priyaṅkara, Ghoranāda, Viśālākṣa, Yogīśa, and Dakṣa-saṁsthita.

Bhūtamātā, Skānda, VII, i, Adh. 167, 2ff.

Caṇḍī-saptaśati, Mārkaṇḍeya ; referred to in Bṛhaddharma, Uttara-Kh., 7.

Devīs, avatāras of, Skānda, Prabhāsa-Kh., 7.—*Dvādaśa Ds.*, Bhaviṣya, Uttara-pa., 127.—*Caturdaśa-Ds.*, Skānda, Māheśvara-Kh., Kaumārikā-Kh., 66. —*Ṣoḍaśa-Ds.*, Brahmāṇḍa, Uttara-bhā., 17.

Gaṅgā-sahasra-nāma, Viṣṇudharmottara, Pūrva-Kh., 50.

Gāyatrī-sahasra-nāma, Devī-Bhāgavata, XII, 6.

Kāma, Vāmana, Adh. 6; Brahmāṇḍa, Uttarabhāga, Adh. 30; Śiva, Rudra-Saṁ., Satī-Kh., Adh. 2; Liṅga, Pūrva-bhā., 99 ff.—*K. and Pradyumna*, Bhāgavata, X. 55 ; Harivaṁśa, 2, 104.—*Worship of*, Bhaviṣya, I, 102, 31; Uttara P., 135-Cf. also Satī's story.

Jala-mātaras, Bhaviṣya, IV, 127, 35 ff.

Kṣetra-dūtis, Skānda, Prabhāsa-Kṣe-mā., 60, 2.

Kṣetra-pāla, Śiva, Vāyavīya-Saṁ., Uttara-bhā., 31, 146 ff.

Kumāra-Aṣṭottara-śata-nāmāni, Skānda, Māheśvara-Kh., Kaumārikā-Kh., 29.

Lokamātaras, daughters of Dakṣa, Brahmāṇḍa, Pūrvabhāga, 63.

Nava-Durgās, Skānda, Māheśvara-Kh., Kaumārikā-Kh., 47.

Nava-Śaktis-Skānda, Kāśī-Kh., 72.

Nīlakaṇṭha, Brahmāṇḍa, Pūrva-bhā., 25 ; Vāyu, 54 ; Mbh., Anuśāsana P., 206 ; Harivaṁśa, III, 31, 83 ff.

Pilgrim centres of various Gods, Skānda, Nāgara-Kh., 109; Kūrma, Uttara-bhā., 35 ff.; Mbh. Ādiparvan, 207; Vāmana, 28 ff; Padma, V, 11; *Ibid*, Ādi-Kh., 38 ff; Bhāgavata, X, 78 ff.; Agni, 305; Viṣṇudharmottara, II, 22.

Śakti—Avatāras of, Prabhāsa-Kh., Pra-Kṣe-Mā., 7.–*D. and Asuras*, cf. text.—*Devī and Prayers*, *Aṣṭaśata-nāmāni*, Matsya, 13, 23 ff.; *Śaktyaṣṭaka*, Bhaviṣya, 1, 201.—*Various Kalās and Prakṛtis*, Devī-Bhāgavata, IX, 1ff; Brahmāṇḍa, Uttara-bhā., 32.—*Pīṭhas (52) of D.*, Brahmāṇḍa, Uttara-Kh., 44; Matsya, 13 ff.; Skānda, V, 3, 198, 6 ff.

Śiva, (1) *and prayers—Śivāṣṭaka*, Skānda, Kāśī-Kh., 10, 26–33; *Aṣṭaśata-nāmāni*, Liṅga, Pūrva-bhā., 96 ff; *Śiva-sahasra-nāma* (by Taṇḍin), Liṅga, Pūrva-bhā., 65; 98, 27 ff.–(2) *Ś. and Avatāras*, Śiva, Śatarudra-Saṁ., 100.

(3) *Ś. and Asuras–Ś. and Andhaka*, Varāha, 27 and 90; Vāmana, 10; Viṣṇudharmottara, Pra-Kh., 226; Harivaṁśa, 2, 86; Liṅga, Pūrvārdha, 93; Matsya, 179; Mbh. Droṇa P., 156; Śalya P., 16, 43; Padma, 5, Adh. 43; Saura, 29, 15; Skānda, VI, 151 and 228 ff; Kāśī-Kh., 16 etc.–*Ś. and Bāṇa*, Śiva, Rudra-Saṁ. (5), 51 ff; Harivaṁśa, 2, 126; I, 3; Bhāgavata, X, 62.—*Ś. and Dāruka*, Skānda, Māhe-Kh., Kaumārikā-Kh., 63; Liṅga, Pūrva-bhā., 106–*Ś. and Gajāsura*, Śiva, Rudra-Saṁ. (5), 57.–*Ś. and Jālandhara*, Liṅga, Pūrvabhā., 97.–*Ś. and Tripura*, Matsya, 29; Liṅga, Pūrva-bhā., 71.–*Ś. and Vyāghrāsura*, Śiva, Rudra-Saṁ. (5), 58.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

2 7 1 . 3 3

Hindu Religion — Various Sects

Origins of Hindu Religious Sects

Dravidians — Religious Sects

- Saivism
- Saktism